MILITARY CHAPLAINS' REVIEW

1972

MILITARY CHAPLAINS' REVIEW

VOL. 1, NO. 4

Social Concern

NOVEMBER, 1972

PREFACE

The *Military Chaplains' Review* is designed as a medium in which those interested in the military chaplaincy can share with chaplains the product of their experience and research. We welcome articles which are directly concerned with supporting and strengthening chaplains professionally. Preference will be given to those articles having lasting value as reference material.

The *Military Chaplains' Review* is published quarterly. The opinions reflected in each article are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Chief of Chaplains or the Department of the Army.

Articles should be submitted in duplicate, double spaced, to the Editor, Military Chaplains' Review, United States Army Chaplain Board, Fort George G. Meade, Maryland 20755. Articles should be approximately 15 to 30 pages in length and, when appropriate, should be carefully footnoted.

Use of funds for printing of this publication has been approved by Headquarters, Department of the Army, 7 September 1971.

IN THIS ISSUE

For many years chaplains have been involved in exciting social action projects. This involvement has increased significantly in the past year. Social concern is now being expressed more fully as a vital and integral aspect of pastoral work, as a creative application of the message of faith.

Progress has been particularly significant in the key areas of race relations, drug and alcohol abuse, and family development. In all of these areas, chaplains have been concerned with the underlying root *causes* of problems, as well as with their *external* manifestations. Chaplains are examining the base of the moral iceberg as well as the tip. Or, to change the metaphor, chaplains have not been content merely to extinguish the fires of individual and societal unrest, they have also been eager to discover why these fires start. Above all, chaplains have been asking how their ministries and their programs can be socially creative.

In order to explore, support and reinforce this kind of experimentation, an OCCH-sponsored conference was held at the US Army Chaplain Board which focused on the subject of social concerns. Both civilian consultants and Army chaplains attended. This issue of the Review contains a partial report of that meeting. Quite naturally the subject of the prophetic stance of the chaplain was a major question. To this point Dr. Douglas E. Jackson argues persuasively that the chaplain who understands the military system and assumes the role of *conciliator* and *expediter* within that system will be much more effective in showing social concern that the chaplain who sees himself as an exacerbating *prophet.*

A more change-oriented and less establishment-oriented point of view is expressed by the Reverend Daniel L. Pierotti, whose theologically perceptive premises are anchored in a firm base in the religious community. Monsignor Geno C. Baroni, something of a prophet himself in his clear call for attention to middle America, nevertheless claims in a similar way that solid pastoral work is the primary essential, because the chaplain who builds a pastoral base will be better able to communicate his social concerns to people and motivate them to carry out social action programs.

Chaplains have vital supportive links to the civilian community

by virtue of their endorsement by specific denominations. The research of Dr. Harold H. Wilke, Chairman of the General Commission on Chaplains, indicates that denominational endorsing agencies generally support and encourage chaplains who are involved in creative social action programs, whether off-post or on-post. The *extent* to which an individual chaplain engages in social action programs, however, will usually depend on his personal sense of identity as a man and as a chaplain.

Chaplain Kapusta's article gives assurance that dynamic social action is a reality on a post and indicates that the long tradition of such chaplain action overseas is now being strengthened in CONUS. That we are willing to deal with hot social issues is illustrated in Chaplain Hulme's contribution.

The Army will continue to expect chaplains to provide inspiration, insight, programs and results in the area of social concerns. Our prophetic involvement in such areas as drugs, race and concern for the family have enabled us to be relevant in rapidly changing times. We are not so much motivated, however, by judgments on our own posture as we are motivated by the needs of God's children in the military, not so much interested in the problems as we are concerned about the people who have them.

GERHARDT W. HYATT
Chaplain (Major General), USA
Chief of Chaplains

MILITARY CHAPLAINS' REVIEW—VOL. 1, NO. 4

November, 1972

Page

Articles:

Theories and Approaches to Community Problems
Dr. Douglas Ewing Jackson, Ph.D. 1

Alienation, Identity and Middle America
Monsignor Geno C. Baroni 20

Endorsing Agencies and Community Concern
Dr. Harold H. Wilke, D.D. 24

Mission Strategy and Social Concern
Rev. Daniel L. Pierotti 33

Social Concern from a Post Chaplain's Viewpoint
Chaplain (COL) Emil F. Kapusta 47

Social Concerns
Chaplain (LTC) John W. Hulme 52

Conference Conclusions 55

Book Reviews: 57

THEORIES AND APPROACHES TO COMMUNITY PROBLEMS

Dr. Douglas Ewing Jackson, Ph.D.

Max Weber, who died about forty years ago, is considered to be one of the greatest sociologists. He was unusually gifted in two areas. One was in the field of the sociology of religion and the other was in the field of bureaucracy. I am certain that his expertise in these two areas is connected.

Weber has probably written the best book on bureaucracy. Furthermore, he deals with the *prophet* in almost all of his works on the sociology of religion, discussing what prophetic ideals are or ought to be. He has written long studies of various religions, both Christian and non-Christian, and finds prophets in all of these religions. In addition, he is the person who first used the term *charisma* to apply to a personality and he used it in the Greek sense of a grace, a gift, a power that everyone can see. He feels that the grounding of the prophet is in this charisma, that if you do not have the charisma, you are not going to be a prophet. It doesn't make any difference how learned you are, how sophisticated you are, how great your influence is, or that you have the right connections. You have got to have charisma. If you do not have that, you will not become a prophet.

Sometimes I think that young seminarians and young ministers who want to be prophets lack charisma. The student who will have it usually has it when he arrives. All we professors can attempt is to keep him from making a fool of himself with it. But even when a person with charisma does foolish things, his foolishness often is not apparent. For the grace which is such an essential element in charisma is so strong that frequently he is able to convince everybody that he is right. An unlearned man with charisma, therefore, can be a very dangerous person.

Weber states that the prophet is an *individual* who does not really make his decisions according to what other people think.

Dr. Jackson is Professor of Sociology of Religion in Southern Methodist University's Perkins School of Theology. He is a member of the General Board, Christian Social Concerns of the United Methodist Church.

Nor does he reflect on what the institution to which he belongs thinks. He is almost unique. He has a *very strong ego.* This ego is apparent—it is probably part of his charisma. Weber then states that the prophet is authentic when he is engaged in a breakthrough in some social institution or in society as a whole, that there is an observable factor in the organizational pattern with which he disagrees sharply. He attempts to change it, even if it means destroying the institution itself. Using the term *prophet* in that kind of classical sense, I think you can immediately see the difficulty of being a prophet in the military chaplaincy or in any other kind of chaplaincy. The work of the prophet gets carried on after he is gone, as Weber says, by *institutionalized* charisma. The institution grows up and tries to work out guidelines that have been informed by the charisma of the founder. It tries to regulate and control other people so that they accomplish what the prophet wished to accomplish.

I think this comes close to being where the chaplain is. He is institutionalized. He must use structures of authorization and recognition. I think that the most we can expect of a man in the chaplaincy is that he be a second generation prophet, a kind of institutionalized charisma.

SOCIAL PROCESS

I want to talk now about *social action,* a term that is often used these days. As a sociologist, I prefer a term that nobody is going to use frequently, not even me. The term is *social process.* The reason I use this lattern term is that the term *social action* implies a bias which favors social change, that social change is always good. Social change in some areas is good, but social *stability* is often better. If one is appropriately responsible, he will sometimes *oppose change.* For instance, I strongly believe that our society is in danger today because of the destruction of our family structure. I don't know what the future holds for family relationships. We have moved from the extended family—which Gerhard Lenski states has been very strong in Catholic groups—to the nuclear family. We may be moving toward an atomistic family. The extended family contained the grandparent in the home, helping to indoctrinate and inculturate the grandchildren. The grandparent was an important person who had a role to fulfill; he was loved and respected—able to do something important. Now we are putting grandparents in nursing homes, destroying most of their meaningful lives and doing away completely with the opportunity of transmitting the culture to the grandchildren. That is the area in which I would like to have fought to *prevent* social change.

In addition, I am very much dedicated to the family-size farm, which is almost gone. That is also an area where I think that social actions would have called for an attempt to *preserve* the status quo, rather than moving toward something completely different. Instead of social action, therefore, I would prefer to speak of social *process*. On occasion, the best action is that of reinforcing of reexamining, holding on to a position that has been valuable for a long time, a position that helps society to promote justice.

BUREAUCRACY

Now let's examine *bureaucracy*, the other word. I hear almost nothing good said about bureaucracy. Max Weber, however, says that of all the possible forms of organization for large groups, bureaucracy is the best. All organizational forms, including bureaucracy, have problems, problems which seem almost native to themselves. But bureaucracy, when it is done right, is the best one. What bureaucracy seeks to do is to minimize the emotional and personal content of policymaking, as well as the political aspect. It seeks to establish standards that become the rationale for a definition of categories. It seeks to establish precedents, so that when once a decision has been made rationally, other decisions fall comfortably into place. Thus problems in the same category already have their solutions worked out for them. Now that encourages a very efficient operation. The difficulty that Weber points out is that in the second generation the goals originally held by the institution get displaced and the procedures and instrumentalities used to achieve these goals become new goals in themselves. What unfortunately can become important is the *preservation of the bureaucracy,* rather than the *achievement of the goal* for which the bureaucracy was established. You can apply this concept to the military bureaucracy better than I can.

I will give one reference to a recent bureaucracy theory which I think is good. Daniel Lipwack has written in one of the sociological journals that we need to recognize that there are two tension-laden types of bureaucracy. (The tension between these two means that we have some problems to solve.) One of the bureaucracies deals with *routine* performance, with problems arising regularly that have arisen before. The use of routinization reinforces efficiency. The other bureaucracy centers on *innovation.* An extreme example is the research laboratory. In the research laboratory a bureaucracy may exist which is geared toward trying to invent something. If the something *is* invented, it may change not only that bureaucracy but also the whole

world. It has the potential for doing that. This might be called bureaucracy for change.

Now inventors (and the literature shows that they are strange people) constantly resent authority. They abhor any kind of authority. Therefore, in an bureaucratic structure, you must slip up on them with authority. You've got to hold hands and stroke them appropriately and say that you recognize how good and hard they have been working even if in twenty years they have not found a cure for cancer. They have to be rewarded. But, if the laboratory is successful in its work, it will then call for some of its discoveries to become routinized. This starts the development of the first kind of bureaucracy and a possible conflict. There can be, however, an interplay between the two different types of bureaucracy. The bureaucracy that works within ordinary routinization can be aware of the other things that are going on in the other kind of bureaucracy. In concert they can result both in more efficiency and in the enlargement of their goals.

SELF-RIGHTEOUS IDEOLOGIES

You have often heard the term *liberal* used and this term is normally associated with social action. I have been a conservative and I have been a liberal, and I prefer to use the past tense with both terms. For me the book that is important in this area is a book by Daniel Bell of Columbia University called *The End of Ideology*. Bell states that we can no longer afford to call ourselves liberals or conservatives. We have got to be technicians or pragmatists. There are many areas in which we are trying to find answers. If we look only in the liberal quadrant or in the conservative quadrant, the answer may escape us, because it may fly off into an entirely different dimension in which liberal and conservative values have no real applications. Bell was indebted to John C. Bennett, who wrote a book entitled *Social Salvation*. In the preface to that book, written in 1937, Bennett said that one of the great problems with religious people is that they try to reduce social problems to a web of sin. It is not a problem unless it is sinful. If it is a problem, it must be sinful, which means you have to find somebody to blame. It also means that the "judge" usually appears self-righteous himself. It is not only the problem which causes trouble, but the stance of the "judge." He is the man with the *truth*, the man on the *white horse*, the man who is going to *lead* you into the *future*.

I think that the message of many of the young in our day has been hurt because of the self-righteous poses they have adopted. I point to those who are under thirty, and also those who in spirit are under thirty. They are absolutely certain that

nobody else has anything right—else things would not be so fouled up. If we can escape this kind of liberal-conservative continuum and begin to ask questions about what is it we want, and how are we going to get there, we are ready to proceed to appropriate analyses of important community problems. What are the elements of the problems that we must see? How do we go about finding them?

STEREOTYPES

We as religious people, ordained men, are trying to enage in social action in many areas. Frequently we have trouble because of the images of religion that are held in our society. These images of religion often say that it is not appropriate for us to be engaged in social action. Sometimes the images that are held imply that the only way we can engage in social action is thus and so, A, B, C. These kinds of images are difficult for us to break through. We cannot break through them until we at least recognize them.

If you ask individuals in our society who the important people are in the field of religion and give them opportunities to indicate who they would most want to be like, they often answer: Billy Graham, Norman Vincent Peale, or Oral Roberts. These might not be the people, however, that *we* would want to choose. These leaders, however, are the people who help shape the public's image of what religion is. There was a time when Billy Graham was a kind of prophet thundering for a breakthrough. He is not quite that way any more. I don't know whether he is better received now than previously. At any rate he is not a man who goes out and breaks the lance for social action, nor is Peale, nor is Oral Roberts. (There might be some case for Oral Roberts on race relations.)

Other important names in the field of religion do not produce the image for the average person of what religion is, but rather of what is bad for religion. If you mention to the average laymen the names of Berrigan, Groppe, Coffin, or Rubenstein, they will look at you as though to say, "Where have you been? Why have you been thinking about *those* kinds of persons?" Yet, for the young, these are all *heroes*. They come to a college campus and many people who are not inclined by nature toward religion hear them, people who haven't been to a chapel for a long time. In part they draw the young because they do not fit the image of religion. It is almost an attempt to hear meaning in the area of religion from somebody who is not classified as religious.

I did not add the name of Sol Alinsky because Sol doesn't really know whether he wants to be called religious or not. He

has been accepted, however, both by councils of churches and religious groups. His greatest effect has been in working with religious people, even though he denies that he is religious.

Some people emphasize the image of the clergyman as counselor. They see this as the clergyman's primary function, whether that counseling produces adjustment, or helps find a solution to the problem. Although most people see the minister primarily as a preacher, they want his sermons to be firey and strong on something that everybody agrees on, not something he feels deeply. He shouldn't be too scholarly and he shouldn't be too advanced. Chaplains have the extra image of the military uniform.

With that as a background, we should ask wehther the *sermon* is the most effective way of bringing about social change. Why would we want to use a sermon? Is there any ego involvement in this that needs a release—a catharsis or perhaps exposure? I'm trying to teach our students that many times the dilemma they face is that they can either get things done without getting any credit for themselves or they can get a lot of credit for themselves for being holy and righteous. They can't do both. (Now that is overstating it because I have very young students. They haven't thought about this dilemma before and I have to engage in a little bit of overstatement).

POWER STRUCTURES

In the sociological field the study of power structures is considered important. One of the first studies was published in 1953. It was by Floyd Hunter, who examined the city of Atlanta, Georgia. His book is called *Community Power Structure.* Dr. Hunter stated something like this: "The people of Atlanta will pick up their *Atlanta Constitution* one morning and they will read that a serious problem confronts that city. The solution to that problem is imperative and if it doesn't get solved, the whole state of Georgia may actually be wiped off the face of the map. In the next few days, two or three other papers will tell how grave the situation is. Then after everybody gets on the edge of his seat and wonders what's going to happen, suddenly there is a big story—the problem has been solved. Somebody has come to the rescue—always somebody important in the city. He has the answer and it is a strange thing that we all didn't see this in advance. Now that he has told us what to do, we will all, as good citizens, get together and do it and on we'll go." Well, Dr. Hunter was interested in who decides what the problem is, how they get the newspapers to publish the story, and how they decide who is the correct man who will come up with the solution. He concluded that in the city of Atlanta a pyramidal power structure

exists. At the top there is a little intimate group of from five to eight men. Below that there are about two dozen. Below that the pyramid spreads out to about 250. This is the power base. People at various levels take on problems of different degrees of importance. If the problem is of any really great importance, it has to come up at least for ratification by the top group.

Who were these people? Well, they were all *business* people, people who had shown themselves not only to be good money makers, good organizers, good managers, but also people who were interested in the welfare of Atlanta as a whole. The power structure did not include a woman or a professional person who was practicing a profession. There was a Ph.D. or two who were now in business. No member of labor was at the top level. No blacks or other minority groups were part of this pyramidal power structure.

He also made a study of the black community, and found that it had its *own* power structure. Bad communications between the power structures of the black and white communities existed. They didn't know each other. It was not that they were antagonistic, but that there was a great lack of understanding concerning who actually fulfilled what roles.

Since 1953 at least 55 communities in the United States have been studied, as well as a large number in foreign countries. Of these about one third are pyramidal, about one third are factional and about one third are fluid. The factional ones usually have two factions in conflict with each other. (When you have that kind of relationship, you can play one off against the other.) In the fluid ones, different groups of people take responsibility in quite different areas with the decision not having to go up to the top of a power structure.

Clergymen are not generally found in the community power structures. Of the 55 communities that have been studied—if we're talking about the total community, not a minority community—only one clergyman was in the top power structure. He was an Episcopal Bishop who had been a resident in that city for twenty years and was a member of an old family from that area. One cannot be absolutely certain how much of his presence in the power structure was the result of his being religious or how much of it was a result of his family connections.

Some religious people, however, *are influential.* A study of Dallas indicated that a pastor who had just left the city could have been in the power structure if he had wanted to be. He was actually always on the edge of it and the power people wanted him in deeper than he was willing to get in. But he said that he had to run his church; he couldn't solve local problems also. An-

other man, a Jewish Rabbi, could be heard on anything he wanted to talk about. He was, however, intelligent enough not to bring up more than one problem a year, which goes back to the point that one cannot be an expert or a bombastic person on every issue. The Superintendent of Schools in Dallas, for instance, after the assassination, suspended a teacher for something she said. He was evidentally going to fire her. This was one of those issues the Rabbi felt was extremely important. He felt that the teacher should not lose her job. Within less than 24 hours the Superintendent of Schools, who was an extremely powerful man in the city, issued a "clarification" in the newspaper. Indicating that there had been some abuse over the telephone against this teacher, he felt that she needed to take a little vacation trip where she could be away from the harassment. She would be back at work the first of the week and would miss no pay. The Rabbi, you see, had *some* power.

The expansion of public housing was another issue. Many persons in important positions did not want public housing expanded; they felt that the city had enough. The Rabbi disagreed. He got several of his important businessmen at the temple to assemble together. They discussed strategy to increase public housing. One of the gentlemen who was a well known businessman in the city said, "I'll do some research and I'll call some people to do some research for me." Within less than a week he sent a ten page single-spaced letter—it was a brief, an economic brief—indicating how it would be economically advantageous for the city of Dallas to have more public housing. The letter did not take the position that it would be advantageous socially or democratically. It would only be advantageous *economically*. He knew his audience. He knew how to prepare a brief and where to send it—directly to a member of the power structure. Ten days after he fired off this letter, the mayor of the city made an important speech in which he stated that he believed that it was desirable economically for the city of Dallas to obtain more public housing and he gave the data that was in that letter. There was no indication where he got the data, or who had influenced him. I happen to know all this because I was involved in helping to prepare some information. I found out a long time ago that if you begin to tell about these things by naming names and people, and giving data to the public, the door of influence will become closed to you. You may get publicity, and you may have your moment in the sun, but you will never get an opportunity to do anything more.

The teaching we are trying to get across to our seminary students today is that you have to make a choice. You have to

learn how to keep confidences. You have to recognize that you don't have all the answers, that you are a *resource person,* an informant, a person who can be an expert. This is your *chief way of affecting the power structure.* I don't believe that as a clergyman you will get *in* the power structure. You might get in a power structure of a *church,* but not in the power structure that is making important decisions in a city, a region, or the nation. But you can become an *influential.* You can become an informant. You become a person who is *trustworthy.* In that way, you can have influence.

FIELDS OF FORCE

The next item I wish to discuss is the idea of fields of force and how they relate to social change. Kurt Lewin, who originated the concept, held that where there is conflict, forces will push in one direction and forces will resist in the opposite direction. If you strengthen one force, the normal effect is that the response is also increased. What you may be doing by bringing in more firepower is asking for more firepower in return. You may not get the solution that you want. You may even get a problem that becomes more complicated.

Lewin asks people to consider what happens when force is pulled away. Will it mean that one side will automatically overrun the other? No, it often means that the other side will also pull back. One side can then say to the other side, "What are you really trying to get?" "Is there some way that we can go about talking about our common needs and really erase the problem?" Not that anybody has to have a solution—we will just let the solution emerge by nobody pushing one way or the other. Naturally this is better in theory than in practice. Sometimes it doesn't work out so neatly, but Lewin had some beautiful examples from his experiences. I will offer one from my experience because I think it shows the way it could work.

During World War II, there was a great deal of food rationing, particularly of meat. The best cuts of meat were very difficult to obtain. There was also an additional problem of trying to get the populace to accept rationing. Many appeals were used, including appeals to patriotism: "You want your men who are fighting overseas to eat the best meat, don't you?" "If somebody is going to eat it, don't you think our fighting men ought to?" Generally, this did not cause housewives to use cheaper cuts of meat with alacrity. They still grumbled and fussed for the best cuts. Lewin, therefore, inaugurated a study in St. Louis which would hint at another reason for using cheaper meats. At that time a lady operating under the name of Betty Crocker, an expert

cook—the Julia Childs of the present day—held cooking schools. They scheduled her into a cooking school in a giant auditorium and suggested that all women would want to see her demonstration. It would be hard to get tickets, so of course everybody rushed in. She demonstrated how to cook good fancy dishes. She did not say that she was using cheap cuts of meat or less than the best cuts. She merely showed how to make *tasty* dishes. She therefore trotted out all these recipes calling for poorer cuts of meat. She showed how to doll them up and she talked about serving them for so many cents a day. Then she suggested that when their husbands sampled these new dishes they would say that their wives had really become good cooks. The wives could respond by showing how thrifty they were in addition.

They did followup research on the people who attended to see how many had tried one of these recipes within ten days, a month, and two months. The numbers far exceeded all their expectations and far surpassed any of the control studies which they had run. Now what did this say? It said that a woman's image was not first of all that of a patriot. It was that of a good cook and a good manager of the house with a husband who would appreciate her for these talents. The point here is that change can occur when you *find people's needs*. You can then set up a social action program in terms of their needs.

Force field theory can also work in politics. It is useful in all kinds of social action. A politician friend of mine, talking about Orville Faubus, who was running for governor of Arkansas, indicated that Mr. Faubus at the time he had first run for governor had been essentially a liberal, a populist at any rate. He had finished two terms as governor in a state where no one else had been a third-term governor. He should have stepped down. But Faubus had no salable skills in Arkansas, and no place to go. So this politician friend of mine said, "If old Franklin Roosevelt had been living, he'd of known what to do with Faubus. He would have sent him as ambassador to Peru. Our relations with Peru would probably have suffered, but we wouldn't have had any great demonstration in Little Rock. We wouldn't have had a governor being totally on the side of segregation." Well, I think he was probably right. He was talking about a man who had a need to do something. There were several ways he might satisfy that need. Somebody should have recognized that need and used it for the solution of a social problem.

A. J. Liebling in his book *The Earl of Louisiana* tells how Earl Long integrated the staff of Charity Hospital at New Orleans after some blacks had come to him and said, "We've got to have black nurses. We don't have any in there." His response

was, "You want black nurses? I'll give you black nurses. Don't pay any attention to what I say. I just mean to get things done." Shortly thereafter he went down to Charity Hospital. He said, "Let's go over and see the nigger ward." That satisfied the group which was with him. They walked in, started down the hall, and met a white nurse. He stopped, turned to his aide-de-camp and said, "What's she doing over here?" The answer was, "Why she works over here." Long replied, "You mean you would let the flower of Southern womanhood work over in this ward?" They said, "Well, all the nurses are white." So he said, "Tell them when they leave tonight, they won't be back in this ward any more." "But," they protested, "what are we going to do for nurses in this section?" He said, "You think I care about that? You go find some niggers." He had been assured in advance that there was an ample supply of trained black nurses who would come, if asked. All of this happened very quickly. If he had used the normal process, he would never have gotten it done or it would have taken much longer. But because he understood the climate in which he operated, he functioned well. He didn't change the racial attitude of the people, but he produced a solution for a certain group of people. He also got black votes, and that may be what he was primarily concerned about.

LEADERSHIP

Another important question must be analyzed, namely, what kind of *leaders* are we going to be dealing with and what kind of leaders are *we*? Not only actual, but potential? Sam Blizzard, who is one of the scholars of ministry, has talked to many clergyman and has discovered six functions which clergyman recognize as legitimate to their calling. You are all familiar with these functions. He found that the role of administrator/promoter preempted most of their time. He discovered that most of the men felt very dissatisfied and frustrated in that role. Even worse, they felt that they had not been adequately trained to carry out these functions. Now, hopefully, those of us teaching in seminaries have begun to use this feedback. Blizzard is at Princeton Theological Seminary; he studied this subject under the auspices of the American Association of Theological Schools. We have all been informed by it. Most of our clergymen want to fulfill all six roles, which is difficult just in terms of time.

All of the studies which have been made by Blizzard, by Hemple, and by Culver indicate that the average clergyman will spend seventy hours a week or more in professional operations. However, he spends very little time in the preparation of sermons—no more than three to four hours out of seventy. Most

clergyman feel that preaching is one of the major, if not *the* major, function; yet you couldn't tell it by how much time they spend in preparing for it. If men don't have enough time to prepare their sermons, it's not too likely that they will have time to study the social issues that come along.

Let us consider now the influence chaplains have. When I first started teaching, many of my students had just come back from World War II. A large proportion of them were studying for the ministry because they had been influenced by a military chaplain. The *most* influential man in their role choice had often been a military chaplain. Because of the way the world has changed, that's just not happening now. Most men make their choice for the ministry at age 17 or 18. Not very many men are in military service now at 17 or 18. In World War II, men were going into the army at an earlier period of time, and they were deferring decisions because of military service. The impact of the chaplain was thus at its maximum. A great number of persons now have not made up their minds what they are going to be when they get into or escape from military service, and they are not exposed to the chaplain at the moment when they are making that decision. The role of chaplains today, therefore, must be appropriate to the experience of the people they want to influence.

Elaine Burgess in her book *Black Leadership in a Southern Community* states that in the community of Durham, North Carolina, the black leaders were all required to talk back to the white man in public and put the white man down. One of the roads to leadership was to show that you were not the white man's black man. Underlying this whole study is the idea that you are going to have to recognize that certain leaders are not just filling ego needs when they engage in behavior that you do not think is appropriate. They are furnishing an image to the people whom they are leading. Many black men today cannot sit and reason with us, and accept our logical propositions, without losing status in the black community.

SIMPLISTIC FORMULATIONS

Another point worth mentioning concerning community problems is that the social problem *as formulated and publicized* may often be grossly inaccurate and perhaps not even important. There are three sources I wish to call your attention to in dealing with this. One of the best books I have read in the last two or three years is by Edward Banfield, who is Professor of Urban Government at Harvard. It points out that the statements of social problems in our day largely depend upon two professional

groups, one of them *academic* and the other *political.* The academic person has no power if he is just teaching abstract material. If he gets into a definition of social problems, however, he becomes a power figure. The politician can use a social problem to run on. There is a relationship between the two. The academic community more and more becomes advisor to the political community. What man can think about running for the Presidency unless he has his brain trust of learned professors telling him what to do. The problem is that for a man to be elected on a social problem, he has got to have a *simple problem and a simple solution.* In the world in which we live, there are very few simple problems. I would state almost as a truism that any simple problem is of no importance. The important problems are all complex. Politicians make the problem sound simple in order to claim a simple solution, but it never really works. After the election the politician forgets about that simple problem and that simple answer and goes on to another kind of simple problem. You have a succession, as Banfield says, of a problem a year. All of us have a vested interest in keeping it alive. But the problem is much more complex than we thought it was at first.

Last year it was ecology. It's not going to be solved by doing away with phosphates in detergents. It's not going to be solved by fining Standard Oil $2500 because it has an oil spill in the Oakland Bay area. That just is not a solution. It only sounds like a nice simple solution. Many of the issues on which the church has spoken have been issues to which it has given simplistic answers.

Almost every Protestant communion annually issues some kind of statement on economic issues. The Catholic church has essentially issued four social encyclicals from 1890 to the present. Every one of its encyclicals involve a large amount of spade work—getting the important issues laid out in priorities and stating the impact of the Christian gospel upon them. Any statement that came out made references to Scripture and to sacred tradition. It told why this problem is a matter of Christian concern. It was not just warmed over sociology. And I would trade *all* of the statements made on economics by *all* of the Protestant communions for the four encyclicals that the Catholic church has made. I think they are that good. They are not simple statements. They are profound.

Daniel P. Moynihan has written persuasively about hidden agendas in his book *Maximum Feasible Misunderstanding,* in which he talks about the war on poverty. He indicates that in an issue such as OEO, some vested interest groups take someone else's formulation of a problem and use it for their own personal

gain. They are not really interested in the solution of a problem. They are interested in riding piggyback. If you want to read a hair-raising story of how local political groups are not concerned with the poor at all except to manipulate them, I recommend that you read this book. But he also indicates that many of the people who were interested in the powerless were not interested in doing away with poverty. They may have been interested in bringing power to the poor but not to end poverty, since poverty was a good issue to continue to use to stir up the need for social change.

Robert K. Merton, who is a sociologist at Columbia University and one of the best in the country, in an introduction to a book he has written entitled *Contemporary Social Problems,* says that there is something that is really a little worse than a hidden agenda. That is that every social problem that gets dealt with by a social scientist is in truth the backside, the dysfunction, of some value held strongly by a large mass of American people. Problems arise as a result of something that other people like. Poverty occurs because someone is making money from it. In very broad statements, he says that most of our problems in the United States arise because American people love freedom and resent authority. They want to solve things by themselves; they want to do their own thing. They do not really believe in engaging and planning corporate action. He claims that if we were interested in corporate action we could give up a few benefits in order to achieve substantial benefits.

The prison revolt in Attica raised the problem of prisons once again. This question has been dealt with for a long time, just as poverty has been. Prisons have been rediscovered. So we ask the question, What are we doing in prisons? Well, what we are doing in prisons is not what we say we are doing. We are punishing, we are making ourselves feel good, we are training a group of people for crime so that they will fulfill the prophecy that we have of them, namely, that they are bad seeds and nothing can really be done to redeem them. If we were really deeply interested in redemption, in rehabilitation, it would cost us much more money than we are willing to expend. Merton says you never solve a social problem without seeing first what benefits have produced this social problem. You then ask the question, Must we give up those benefits or do we need to change societal structures so that all kinds of benefits can be preserved? The latter alternative is not always available.

THE SYSTEMS APPROACH

We agree that we have complex problems. What are we going to do about them? One of the models which has been used is a

systems approach to community problems. We set our goals very precisely. We know what it is we are after. We assign priorities. Then we decide what will work in attaining these goals. What is the process of evaluation? What is the process of feedback? You don't have a system unless you have both evaluation and feedback. There must be the possibility of being able to alter the system—perhaps even changing the goals on the basis of the feedback. If we have a system we have clear definitions of goals and steps to achieve those goals. I don't mean that everyone must do everything. Specialization of role is helpful. A greater degree of cooperation is also helpful, and this fits in neatly with bureaucracy. In the systems approach chaplains would see themselves as part of a total religious system in our society, a system which in turn is a sub-system of the totality of society.

THE CHAPLAIN'S ROLE

What is the chaplain's role in social action? He must begin by carefully studying and understanding the bureaucracy within which he operates. Bureaucracy is often criticized without being analyzed. One does not have to attack the dysfunctional elements of bureaucracy to have them removed. One needs only to find a problem that these will not solve and then produce a superior pattern of doing it. It helps to have the senior person think *he* has developed this superior pattern. He must appear to think of it himself and must get credit for doing it.

Bureaucracies *can* be changed, and they can become very effective means of focusing energy and making efforts effective. Thus if we were going to engage in social action and there were no bureaucracy, I would suggest the *creation* of one. I really believe that the only way you can effectively deal with large groups is to have a bureaucracy. That doesn't mean that I'm satisfied with the bureaucracies I've been in. Universities, without exception, have great problems and I am always fighting battles similar to yours. But we are always battling to make the bureaucracy more efficient, not to destroy it. We want the bureaucracy to ask the right questions and get answers that are appropriate. Robert Townsend, for instance, in his book *Up the Organization,* has not stated that he wants to do away with the organization, but that he wants to make it more efficient and thus more effective.

The chaplain, as a religious participant in the system, can be most effective in the roles of *conciliator* and *expediter.* These two roles. Not a proclaimer prophet. The latter may be what people would like me to say, but I don't see the role of prophet as the place where the chaplain can make his greatest contribution.

In many community problems, the chaplain has the opportunity of being a conciliator because he is partially an outsider. He is not going to have to be around forever to indicate to the public that he has helped bring about the change. In encouraging change, it is often advantageous to be able to move on. It is good to let people forget that they ever held the wrong ideas. They *can* forget it quickly. The chaplain as conciliator can help religious groups and communities to come to an understanding of how they have more in common than they previously thought they had.

The expediter is a little different. The role of expediter doesn't call for mediation; it calls for somebody working behind the scenes, working to bring people to understandings, asking questions until something gets done. Now neither of these roles, conciliator or expediter, is going to bring much *publicity.* The satisfaction that comes will come to a person who is already fairly mature and doesn't need much stroking of his ego.

In the city of Dallas, we were able to integrate the lunch counters in 1951. It wasn't any great thing, but we got it done. It was done in part by talking to the power structure about bad publicity. That's a very powerful weapon on a power structure. They really don't want publicity. The newspaper should only be used as a last resort, because you've really used your ultimate weapon when you go to the newspaper. You should threaten to use it more than you actually use it, and when you use it, use it carefully. Dallas was integrated when the lunch counter in H. L. Green's dime store began serving blacks. A traveling evangelist, G. Ashton Jones, later came through town and stated that he had come to integrate the lunch counters. He was told that they had already been integrated, but he didn't believe it. They said, why not? He said because it hadn't been in the newspapers and it would have been in the newspapers if it had happened. He therefore tried his best to get lunch counters to refuse to serve him and two Negro friends he had brought along. They all served him and because they did (and he was very unhappy about it) he illegally marched with a picket and got thrown in jail. Now that was exactly what he was after to start with. He wanted publicity in the newspapers.

In Indianapolis, Indiana, the Council of Churches worked very hard to get all the hotels and motels to accept black customers by assuring them they would bring meetings of the Council of Churches to the city on a trial basis so that the hotels could see how it worked out, how much more money they got, how there was no damage to the rooms, etc. It worked well with a Federal Council of Churches group. After it was over, the Hotel

Association *quietly* decided, with no publicity, to change their form of policy and accept all the blacks who wanted to come. Their policy was never given any publicity anywhere. Now *that* required a tremendous amount of discipline on the part of a number of preachers who had been involved. They didn't get up and talk about how important they were in getting the Federal Council of Churches here on an integrated basis, but they broke the city wide open. They substantially changed the pattern of the city without damning the hotel owners by stating, "You have been sinful and now you have repented and so we give you absolution and redemption." They just quietly assumed that all the people had a commonality of interest, and that these interests could be served by a changed pattern. We did not have to back people against the wall by judging them as evil. But we got the job done.

CONFRONTATION

Sometimes progress involves confrontation—people telling each other how wrong they are. Literature on this subject is worth reading. Professor Thomas F. Pettigrew, a Harvard social psychologist, in writing about human relations councils, states that the appropriate people to be on human relations councils are militant blacks and hard core segregationists. The human relations council is no place for a white liberal or for a tame black. The appropriate thing that should happen in human relations councils is that both of these extremes should stand up and shout at each other. You can't have either side understanding the identity needs of the other unless shouting occurs.

Pettigrew points out that in human relations councils where there are white liberals, the white liberals promise the blacks more than they can deliver. Blacks know at the time that they won't get action. The liberals, furthermore, become frustrated. The result is that blacks come away from such meetings with feelings of disrespect for white liberals. Throughout much of the South today, blacks have little respect for white liberals. This did not develop because white liberals held wrong positions, but because *they don't get things changed.* The people who are in control of race situations are usually segregationists. They need to be exposed to militant blacks, to sit and listen to them so that they can hear something that can be changed. Pettigrew believes that when face-to-face opposition occurs, clarification of goals develops, as well as understanding on the part of people who have different life styles and beliefs.

The non-judgmental chaplain can serve as a "neutral" expediter in one of these situations; he can reformulate statements

in such a fashion that the leaders' needs for identity are met. By constantly requesting a clarification of each side's goal, he will help the group to focus their language and interests on something that is important. This may not produce agreement, but it will normally produce respect on the part of the protagonists for each other. If the human relations council works at all well, the decision-making process will be opened up so that more people will be involved than ever before. It means that all the decisions won't be made on Main Street, that some of them will be made out in the patio or in the ghetto or in the union hall.

This kind of interaction, in which creative conflict produces "solutions," is probably much more important than the church realizes. The experts who write about the field of conflict as a salutary element in social change, generally hold the point of view that there can be no long range efficacious social change without some conflict. This conflict can serve a useful purpose. The problem is that we don't want conflict just to *happen.* We want conflict itself to be *well ordered,* articulated in a fashion that will make a *contribution.* Not all conflict is productive. Conflict needs to be "engineered" around an appropriate subject. This is why I think that Pettigrew's ideas about human relations councils are good.

Sol Alinsky has become famous as the apostle of conflict as a means of securing social change. I am sure you have read some of Alinsky. If you haven't read him, at least read *Reveille For Radicals,* which has to do with some of his conversations. It can be read easily in an hour and it will give you the flavor of the man. He tells about an address he made in a Chicago ghetto. One black came up and said, "I want to ask you a question, are you speaking for all the honkies?" Alinsky's reply was, "Before I answer your question, I want to ask you one." "Are you asking the question for all the black people?" Well, the man was a little taken back with that and he used some profanity to which Alinsky replied in kind. He said, "I want you to know that I am not one of those screwed up neurotic liberals. I don't think you are any better than I am; I think you are just equal to me. I think I'm every bit as good as you are and you are every bit as good as I am." Well, you know, talking like that creates conflict. Since at least 1945 Alinsky has been creating this kind of conflict. He says that what you want to do is to pick on a person and create animosity in him at some *unimportant* point. But *you* are important to him. The life style that you are challenging should be something that is relatively unimportant, but he's got to hear that what you're saying is basically very important.

Alinsky organized the Woodlawn Community in Chicago. Almost every public meeting that occured in Chicago had some black representative from the Woodlawn Community raising the question, "What are you going to do about race?" Blacks entered relatively innocuous PTA meetings. No matter what the agenda, no matter how dulcet-toned the president, somewhere that black would arise and say, "What you gonna do about the blacks?" Well, you can imagine the president replying, "That's not on the agenda. There's nothing we can do about it. That's not our topic." "Well it oughta be on the agenda, is there any more important problem?" It wasn't just the issue that made people angry, it was the discourtesy, the refusal to follow normal procedures and protocol. But Alinsky says, "What we're saying is that all the institutions have been set up under rules that are to the white man's advantage. When you talk discourteously, you turn me off, because my grammar isn't good. When you put me on an agenda, you force me to plan to meet deadlines and my people don't meet deadlines. When you talk about something that is our problem, you talk about a trivial issue because that's all PTAs normally deal with. Now what we're trying to say to you is that we've got something important to say, and even if we just thought about it yesterday or we just thought about it two minutes ago, *it's still important.* And we feel very, very deeply and we're gonna let you know about it."

CONCLUSION

As clergymen all of us want to be involved in social action. We should be willing to take risks to help people, to improve society. We have come out of a prophetic tradition which suggests that Christianity is a prophetic religion. Admittedly, no church exists in which a man can be a prophet without risking his neck. However, risk-taking is an essential part of most of us so that we are willing to risk our necks every so often for the right cause. Part of our problem is that we need to find out *where* we *can* be prophets, where success is possible.

We should never be prophets just to be prophets, however. We need to be issue-centered rather than self-centered. Progress is too often undermined by the person who *becomes the issue* and thereby obscures the real issue. My suggestion to chaplains is that the most prophetic role they can assume within the military bureaucracy is that of conciliator and expediter—persons who understand the system and make it work more effectively in bringing justice to the people they serve.

ALIENATION, IDENTITY AND MIDDLE AMERICA

Monsignor Geno C. Baroni

I want to talk about where we have been, where we are now, and what I believe are some of our problems. Currently we as a nation do not seem to have a national sense of *identity*; we do not seem to have a national sense of *commitment* or *purpose*. We are very fragmented. Recently a few of us examined once again the Kerner Report which was issued in March of 1968. We went back to Newark, Detroit, and East Los Angeles and looked carefully at these cities; we concluded that polarization has increased, that the problems have gotten worse. By 1980 many American cities will be black, brown and broke. We are headed for even more trouble.

We have been through a difficult ten years. If we understand where we have been in the last ten years and where we are today—the challenges that face us, as well as the opportunities—maybe we can begin to see what kind of ministry we should have. In the 60's a small group of young people whose parents made money—upper, upper middle-class children—began to react, to rebel against the war, and to become part of the drug scene. They also began to rebel against the quality of life in America. The first kids who came to the ghetto in 1960 were Harvard and Radcliffe Unitarians. They were soon followed by Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Methodists, and finally Catholics. Anyway, gals with 38 pairs of shoes, 38 dresses, and a Jaguar came to the ghetto to help the poor. They were persons who didn't want to go into plastics or didn't want to make a lot of money. The children of affluence began to rebel.

Rebellion also occurred in the 60's at the *lowest* economic and social level when a hundred and fifty-seven cities exploded. The economic revolt—the riots and the rebellions in the cities—began to capture American attention. During this time the so-called middle American watched but did not revolt. In the 60's we thought everything was black and white, rich and poor. We di-

---

Monsignor Baroni is the Director of the National Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs in Washington D.C. This article contains excerpts from his outstanding "stream of consciousness" presentation.

vided everything into these categories. In reality, however, one hundred million Americans, the so-called silent majority, lived quietly between these two groups. And that is where most whites are; that is where most white church people are. My prediction is that *middle America* will begin to make itself heard, and perhaps *revolt* in a variety of ways in the 70's.

The middle American has problems. He can't stomach Woodstock and he can't tolerate the college kids who didn't go to Vietnam. He is very angry with them, you know. Neither does he understand black heroes such as Malcolm X or Martin Luther King. Who are *his* cultural heroes? Nobody. And he is very angry because he is now being told, "Well, it's no-no war." You know, he went for nothing. He is also angry with Jerry Rubin and Abbie Hoffman; he is angry with their symbols—Woodstock and drugs. Furthermore, he is very uptight; he doesn't understand what happened in the black community. He is thus a sign and symbol of middle-American *anxiety*, an anxiety ready to *explode*.

One of the things we have to try to understand is that America is asking a theological question: Who am I? America is trying to discover itself. America is diverse, fragmented, and alienated—a nation of immigrants. What can unify us? What can bring us together? What do we have in our diversity that is negative and what do we have in our diversity that is positive? My contention is that America is in the business of really finding itself. Kids are beginning to say, "I'm proud to be mountain people," "I'm proud to be hillbilly," "I'm proud to be black."

One question which should concern us is: How does America meet its human and social obligations? The thing that bugs our kids and is going to bug them even more is the fact that America is the richest country in the world. We've got the technology, we've got the industrial capability, we've got the gross national product potential, and we've got the science to put every man, woman and child on his feet. We really could. We're not Asia, Africa, or South America. So the kids say, "If you've got the money and the technology, why do you also have the poverty?" Where is the moral will, where is the guts, where is the soul, where is the commitment, where is that national public will? Take the moon race, for example. People are asking, "What did we bring back—64 pounds of rocks—who can eat *that?* And how much did it cost?" But we did it because we had the national will to do it.

Right now we need housing for people—black, white, brown, rich or poor. In the next ten years we will need 28 million additional units of housing. However, we are building at the rate of

only 15 million units. What, then, are you going to have in ten years? You're going to have 28 people looking for 15 houses. What does that mean? Polarization! Why? Because some of these people will be black, some will be white, some will be brown, some will be rich and some will be poor—and you only have 15 houses for 28 families. You're in trouble. That's how polarization will develop.

The average new house being built in our suburbs is starting from $27,000 to $30,000. That means you need to earn $12,000 annually to handle the mortgage. Now the mailman, black or white, as well as many other working men, can't handle the mortgage on a new house. In addition, because of the winding down of the war, industry is laying off many persons. So people are uptight about jobs, as well as housing. They are also disturbed about the cost of health care and education. For example, my brother-in-law asks, "How much would it cost to send my kid to Georgetown?" He makes $9,500 and has five kids; he ain't sending *nobody* to Georgetown. No way can he send anybody to Georgetown. His kids will go to Johnstown Community School night classes. He's also uptight about health care. One heart operation in the family can cost $8,000 and he earns too much to be eligible for assistance. He is more worried about the size of the bill than he is about his health. Big medical expenses could wipe him out.

Another growing anxiety of our time centers on the whole question of *what's it all worth?* What I'm saying is that the real issue in America is no longer the question of *existence,* but the question of the *quality* of existence, the question of *values* and *goals.*

How do you develop leadership here that is positive and healthy, that has a sense of identity? I don't care if you and I argued all day long. As long as we were talking to each other and had respect for each other we could come to something we might agree on. Right? Because I think we've got some common problems.

America is a diverse country culturally, ethnically, and racially. Let's admit it, instead of saying it's the melting pot, that everybody, you know, should be like Miss Virginia Slim or have a certain kind of style. How can you help people *handle* differences? *Admit* the differences, to begin with. Right now many Chicanos, you know, can't read or write in *any* language. They are half-ashamed to be Spanish and half-ashamed to be American. Am I American, am I Spanish, or what am I? Black kids have the same problem, but they are gradually changing.

Many people think that the middle American silent majority is

part of the problem. I say it is part of the *solution.* It has a lot to offer. You can't put it down because that's where most of our soldiers come from, that's where most of the people *are.* I say every foreign policy and every domestic policy has to be dealt with from the point of view of middle America. There aren't enough people in rich or poor America. Every domestic, social or economic issue has got to be dealt with here.

My contention is that every economic problem, every social problem, etc., is also a *moral* problem. Why? It gets down to the question of justice. It gets down to the question of right and wrong.

Middle America, then, will either be *part of the problem* or the *solution to the problem* in the 1970's. Ministers, priests and rabbis need to realize this and to focus their ministries on the tensions and frustrations—the growing alienation—of middle America. The most successful chaplains, the ones who will have the greatest impact, will begin by building a solid base by doing basic pastoral work. This is crucial, because then when they preach on a sensitive moral issue people will validate their credibility. Chaplains in particular minister to middle America. The ministry of chaplains can work to *reinforce* the alienation or it can work to *alleviate* it, *dissipate* it, by honestly facing it and coming to grips with it.

ENDORSING AGENCIES AND COMMUNITY CONCERN

Dr. Harold H. Wilke, D.D.

I want to emphasize some "nuts and bolts" concerns regarding the understanding of several denominations about their chaplains' activities in community outreach. My research was done by long-distance phone calls, by personal conversations and by follow-up letters to various denominational leaders who are involved in chaplaincy activities.

The first question I usually asked was, "How do you feel personally about chaplains' activities in the community?" Second, "What is your reading of your denomination's position?" Third, "What written position has your denomination taken on this?" (The answer to this third question was almost invariably that it has no written position.) And then fourth, "What do you feel are the limits with regard to chaplains' activities?"

I will indicate something of the range of answers which I received; and then I want to discuss the chaplain's personal sense of identity, because I think that a chaplain's understanding of his role in the community, his role as a chaplain, is probably more important than the stand of his denominational representatives.

A representative from one of the major denominations said, "We have many chaplains doing community outreach and we fully support them. Then he mentioned some examples such as drug abuse activity in which these chaplains are active in the community. He added that he thought that the Chief of Chaplains supports this kind of action on the assumption that anything that leads to *oneness* in the community is good. Community activity, however, should not "impinge upon the chaplain's time of fulfilling his regular tasks." The primary concern is "meeting human need" and where needs exist in the off-post community the chaplain shares in the responsibility for meeting them.

Another representative simply said, "Well, for men overseas

Dr. Wilke is the Executive Director of the Council for Church and Ministry, United Church of Christ, and is Chairman of the General Commission on Chaplains.

we do back them up completely in community action, and we expect it. But for the people in the states, if they have time we support them as much as we can." Then he added, "There is nothing in writing on this, but the strong feeling is that the church is in favor of such community outreach and community responsibility. Most of our men, however, are so busy doing their jobs as chaplains that they do not have time for a great deal of off-post community service."

A representative from a black denomination stated, "My personal feeling is that chaplains should be concerned with community outreach and action. Although their involvement may be limited by their total duties, they *should* participate in such activities, especially when the men of their commands are intimidated or discriminated against in the community. This applies both to the on-post and off-post communities."

A more conservative church leader said, "My own personal feelings on this are that we can get involved to a far greater degree than we have. My limits would be those of my own mind. As long as a chaplain did as I approved, there would be no limits, but when I would disapprove I would have to say to myself, 'But you gave him freedom, and every man has to be loyal to his own conscience.' We believe that all ordained ministers must be prophetic and, while disagreeing voices may lead to confusion, the confusion should be temporary, and sounder conclusions should result in the end. Each will have to recognize his primary responsibility and special relationships, and I therefore would place no larger limitations on the chaplain than on a pastor in a parish. The chaplain maintains a very special relationship to the Armed Forces. He ought not do anything, however right in itself, which would hinder his work as a chaplain or create tension between members of the civilian community and members of the military community. For the rest—gung ho!" I have the feeling that this representative probably reflects here the majority of the denominational representatives, that basically the church people say, "'This man has the kind of freedom that provides for his reaching out, doing things beyond the usual set limits of his tasks, and he ought to fulfill them."

Another church executive stated his opinion as follows: "The chaplain should get involved in all activities which are appropriate from the standpoint of time available and also appropriate in the sense of contributing to community goodwill and community understanding of the chaplain's role. Much of this depends on the chaplain's own inclination. Thus we will have certain chaplains who will want to keep closely tied to denominational and local church activities, much of which will inevitably lead them into

various forms of community activity as well." What he is saying here is that if a chaplain *really does* keep close ties with his own denomination, this inevitably leads him into community action through the denomination. In this case the chaplain representative was thinking primarily of his church's national role in Church World Service. He was also thinking of a chaplain of this denomination who provided the food service for the needy of an entire country, practically forming a little Hoover Commission for Austria after World War II.

Another representative, from a more traditional, more conservative denomination, stated, "My understanding of the church's position is very much like my own, possibly even a bit more free. I believe that your suggestion about controversial matters is wise." (I had not made a suggestion. I had asked, "What are the limits in terms of controversial matters," and he read into it a demurrer.) He went on to say, "I believe that your suggestion about controversial matters is wise to the extent that if a chaplain can keep himself from being embroiled in controversial matters in the civilian community without compromise of conviction or failure to care for the interest of his own parish, he should do so."

Here's another statement, also from a conservative denomination. "To the extent that chaplains are encouraged to participate in community activities, the denomination does not place any limitation on them. They are encouraged to involve themselves and their families and to encourage servicemen to become involved in community programs such as tutoring, alcohol and drug rehabilitation, and poverty programs, etc., as their time permits. They are particularly encouraged to cooperate with any of their churches in the area."

Another man, who is not a chaplaincy representative but is instead a member of the executive committee of the General Commission on Chaplains, raised a point which had not been raised by any of the other men, except possibly by implication. He said, "We feel that a *trust level* needs to be maintained for our chaplains. We hold that the chaplain is to be trusted and therefore we feel that we do not need and should not place any limitations on the chaplain. If we were to do so we would in effect be decrying and invalidating a trust level." I thought that this was very important, that it was implied by some of the others, but that it was most clearly explicated by this man.

A leader of a major church felt strongly that a chaplain *ought* to be involved in community activities. "We would support such a chaplain in his activity in the community." Another chaplain representative listed the ways in which his denominational

chaplains have been involved. He felt that they are supported in this involvement: "Scouts, drug abuse prevention, suppression of vice, social athletic events, and so forth. To join or support the local ministerial alliance and the causes espoused jointly by local churches and post religious programs. Joint music programs, concerts, evangelism campaigns, CARE, relief programs—even the raising of funds and labors to help build a church, under special conditions." (He didn't point out what these special conditions would be.) In this case of a major, middle-of-the-road, main line Protestant denomination, there was a feeling that the chaplain is part and parcel of the local community and ought to be involved in all of these disparate ways of showing social concern. This same person a little later pointed out that the chaplain *is* prohibited from doing certain things in the community. Then, however, after listing all of these ways in which a chaplain ought to be involved, he went on to say, "We believe that if a chaplain focuses his talents and energies in fully ministering where his primary duty is, he will find this spilling over in many beneficial ways into the communities outside the gates."

Another denominational representative said, "The denominational people exist to be the chaplain's extended hand into the larger community—to the causes and changes which make their ministries more meaningful, as for example, helping to effect prison reforms." This particular man, whose three-page letter was quite detailed, said things like *prison reform* and one or two other things that he did not go on to define, and I can see prison reform as being a *highly* controversial matter with which many chaplains and indeed many civilian ministers would not want to be involved at all. There are many approaches to prison reform that suggest that what is needed is not *reform,* but pretty basic and *revolutionary change.* In the chaplaincy, furthermore, we have all had relationships with stockades and brigs that would make us look at these simple words *prison reform* and ask, "What do you mean, prison reform?"

Another denominational representative pointed out, "Our denomination has never had to discipline a military or institutional chaplain for injudicious actions in an off-post community, nor have we ever had to spell out what a chaplain could or could not do as a functionary serving a government or a corporate institution. Our general policy is to impose no credal restrictions on our clergymen in their religious ministrations, except to remind them to implement New Testament Christianity, to use good sense and good judgment in ministering freely to persons of other persuasions, and to let their consciences be their guides."

Most of the men to whom I spoke said that they did not have

written policy statements. One church, however, does have what I think is a very interesting written statement on what they expect their chaplains to do. Their statement says in effect: "We do not expect you to be controversially active in your local off-base community, nor do we expect you not to be active—you are free in this. Basically we feel that your understandings about this, your desires for this, your prophetic push, your desire to stick your neck out, and so on, ought to be funneled into our headquarters. Our headquarters, committed as it now is to changing community attitudes, will then transmit or translate your feelings into national church action." This position is different. It is the only church I came across proposing to do it this way. I have the feeling deep down that this is a cop out on the part of this denomination. In a sense the denomination also says at the same time, "Go ahead and be active in your community." I think this is more true to its understanding of what the chaplain ought to be doing than its written statement which says, "Come and send your concerns back to us and we will then as a national body attempt to make the changes in our societal structures as a result of your statements." Let me read in part what a leader of this particular denomination said. "We help our denominational leaders expose power structures and autocratic or hierarchical institutions that are repressive to our people, polluting our environment, misleading our nation, wasting our resources, and leading us to *Götterdämmerung.*" He went on to say that chaplains are expected to "speak articulately to our present organizations in order to achieve the best possible human climate, and then to bring their wider concerns as chaplains to this department in the church national body that we may freely screen and process them for action by our leadership to change the power structures." I suggest that although in a sense it is a cop out, it is nevertheless a very interesting and probably very helpful way of expressing social concern. Concerning the question about limits placed on chaplains, in this denomination "no limitations are suggested to the chaplain, since the chaplain's good sense can be relied upon. However, if the activity is subversive, his endorsement would be withdrawn. If the community action is controversial, even though completely lawful as in civil rights, the chaplain should do whatever is possible to integrate the community, since this is a law of the land, but if he were to enage in an open demonstration, the communion would have to take a very hard look at the matter."

Here's another main line denominational spokesman: "The chaplain should not be in a demonstration; he does not march as a chaplain. We are fortunate in not having chaplains in-

volved in controversial questions. Many of our clergy do, but our chaplains do not." That particular man was number two in his denominational committee. I think that probably his senior would not express it quite the same way.

Another response in a main line church: "The denomination does not set limits for the chaplain and I personally do not, but if a chaplain asks me, 'How about marching in Selma?' my response would be, "What is your goal in this?" and then advice would be offered in terms of what the goal was for the chaplain." (Knowing this particular man, I have the feeling that he would help the chaplain work out his own statement of goal and then support him in whatever side of the question he would opt for.) He went on, "If a chaplain asks for ten days leave to be involved in a march on Washington or in some other demonstration, you would have to face up to the question whether the results would be mainly positive or negative. Would he lose his credibility with the military?" He added, "We must point out that this is academic, since to the best of my knowledge we have no chaplains involved in marches or demonstrations, but we think that the Chaplains Committee and other official bodies of the church would be inclined to take a positive rather than a negative stand if the chaplain were so engaged." I had the feeling that in this particular denomination if a chaplain did march he would be widely applauded and there would be a strong feeling of appreciation for what he had done.

One person told me that we need to ask the Chiefs of Chaplains to emphasize more strongly community action within their particular services. "When I was on a two-week tour last summer," he stated, "I was told by a leading person in the group that the command simply assumed that we would not and ought not do anything off-post in this controversial area." Now this comment aroused a great deal of negative response from other persons. Almost to a man they said that their understanding is that chaplains generally *are* encouraged to do this kind of thing by their commands, that barriers are not placed in their way and that they feel perfectly free to go ahead and involve themselves in various kinds of community activities. The discussion came up later in a General Commission executive committee meeting in the form of a resolution: "Resolved, that we express to the Chiefs of Chaplains a concern about the unnecessary separation of the military from the civilian community." The next day the statement came before the plenary body; there was even more widespread response to it that said in effect that the passage of such a resolution wrongly presupposes that the Chiefs of Chaplains or other persons within the establishment go out of their

way to discourage community action. Someone therefore moved to table the resolution and it was tabled immediately. I think this is important because it indicates that the General Commission on Chaplains is aware that chaplains are encouraged to become involved and that limits are not set in their way. We don't want to pass the kind of resolution which suggests the opposite. I personally am grateful that this tabling action was taken.

Finally I want to spend just one minute on a particular chaplain's position. A chaplain (colonel) in one of the services wrote that he had received a letter from his denominational president inviting him to be a delegate at the Ecumenical Witness on Vietnam in January, 1972. The beginning of this was held in front of the White House with prayers by the heads of the Presbyterian Church, the United Church of Christ, an Orthodox group, the Roman Catholic Church, and about a dozen additional groups. This was the prelude to the Witness on Vietnam scheduled for Kansas City later. This chaplain wrote as follows: "I declined mainly because of timing; however, I do have some misgivings about my role and possible misrepresentation of my position. Had I been able to attend, I would have sought clarification of their goals and some assurance that my participation would not be an embarrassment either to the church or to the service." His denominational officer said to him that participation would *not* be an embarrassment to the denomination, but that the *chaplain* would have to determine whether it would embarrass the service.

Now a statement of an officer of the General Commission on Chaplains: "My thinking on this is that a chaplain is one of the best public relations men the military has. I do not mean that he should gloss over military mistakes, but certainly as a man of God and as a servant to man on behalf of God he is inevitably involved in church and community activities wherever he is stationed. To my mind, this should be encouraged. A great deal of the unfortunate propaganda which arises concerning the military can be corrected by chaplains speaking to the surrounding community and being heard because the community has confidence in them. I believe that in all three of the services this is a general policy. If not, it certainly should be. Every military installation has a direct bearing on the community. I have seen instances both of good and bad relations existing between the civilian and military communities. Both have suffered from bad relations." So much for the "nuts and bolts" aspects of this discussion.

Now I would like to spend some time talking about the

individual chaplain, how he sees himself as a minister, how he sees himself as a man, what he expects of himself and how he understands denominational loyalties and expectations. Let me stress that it is very difficult to set limits, to establish criteria by which a man's adequacy as a minister should be judged. He may see himself as an ambassador, the one who speaks for God. He may see himself as the bearer of a truth which is beyond this world. Many, of course, would downgrade its significance by saying that *all* of our speaking is speaking for God. Many people feel that the minister should be a "Thus saith the Lord" man. I think that what Dan Pierotti was saying this morning about the new stance, the new posture of the minister, was correct in the sense that he is an enabler; he not only preaches from the pulpit but also at the same time serves as an enabler for the community of the faithful. I would have to disagree, however, on the almost complete relegation of the pulpit leader. I think we still have a great need for the strong preacher. The chaplain with charisma is still required, but to *depend* on pulpit work, to depend upon the role which a great many people from fifty different denominational backgrounds still ascribe to chaplains is something that you should not accept for yourself. Preach the Word with the authority which is *in* the Word of God, the *inherent* authority, not the authority that is yours simply because you happen to be standing up there and preaching at 9 or 10 or 11 o'clock on Sunday morning.

We have to look at this sense of role in terms of the ambassador position—the ambassador speaking for God—and recognize both where it is valid and where we have accepted invalid aspects of it for ourselves. You may fall into the trap of being a moral arbiter when people ask what is the ethical position on this or that. It seems to me that you need to separate your understanding of the *faith* away from "mere morality" and at the same time to help the person make his own decision. This means then that you have a role to fulfill which is critically important, namely, to help the individual see that in his particular response you can support him in the moral decision that he makes without necessarily adopting that position for yourself. The chaplain should be able both to help his people as they make decisions about their own community activity and to work through in his own understanding how far he himself can go.

Finally, I come back once again to your own existence, the place where *you* are, the ability on the part of one of you this morning to say, "Regardless of what the position of the chaplaincy or the Army might be, I feel that I can indeed stick my neck out for a particular controversial matter and I would do so

if I felt that my being involved would do any good at all." It is, you see, your particularity, your sense of where you are, your sense of *who* you are that you may not forget. Your involvement, above all, needs to be done in terms of the prophet Nathan's support structure—God. It needs to be done with the realization that maybe that support structure is enough, and you do not need any other.

For me this becomes a very personal thing. What it means is that I need to respond to what God has called *me* to do in terms of *being* Harold Wilke at this point. You too have a particularity, your own identity, your selfhood before God, with a support structure that may sometimes include only God himself. Denominations are saying that you *ought* to be involved in community activity, and that you *ought* to reach out to the whole community which is your responsibility, but that you need to do this in terms of where your own conscience, your own understanding of who you are, and your own particularity lead you in the fulfillment of God's will for you.

METROPOLITAN MISSION STRATEGY AND COMMUNITY CONCERNS

Reverend Daniel L. Pierotti

I believe that we have learned some things about the church vis-a-vis community concerns in the past ten years which are important if we are going to be serious about churchmen involved in the solution of community problems. My purpose, therefore, will be to examine the church in terms of some understandings gleaned from our experience in Washington, D.C., in the 60's [1] and some reflections on the mission before us in the 70's. In doing so I hope to provide some clues for possible involvement of the military chaplaincy in programs of community concern which might help to alleviate the human suffering in our nation.

A major and necessary part of the mission style of the 1960's in Metropolitan Washington was the creation of formal and informal structures or processes by which specific mission tasks were undertaken. The interreligious Committee on Race Relations, the Coalition Morning Breakfast Club, the Wednesday Morning Club, the Ecumenical Cabinet, the Black Churchmen's Ecumenical Training Facility, the Mission Development Coalition—all these and others were created in the 1960's by churchmen to deal with critical situations and mission needs in Metropolitan Washington. They were created because no viable interdenominational or interreligious structures existed to provide the church in the 1960's with the means to deal with the era of civil rights, urban disorders, the rise of black awareness, crisis in the cities and polarization. These structures and processes were more or less appropriate for mission needs in the historical context of the 1960's. The current historical situation can be shown to be sufficiently different from the situation in the early 1960's to require a reassessment of existing religious and ecu-

[1] Based on notes of The Program Staff of the Council of Churches of Greater Washington.

The Reverend Pierotti is the Executive Secretary of the Lutheran Planning Council of Metropolitan Washington. He has served as chairman of the committee on Social Action of the New York Synod of the Lutheran Church in America and as Director of the Cooperative Lutheran Parish of Washington.

menical structures and processes. Formal or informal structures which are geared, say, to a demonstration or confrontation style are not necessarily useful in an historical situation in which institutional re-examination appears to be an important priority for the church.

There is no doubt that the ecumenical mission of the church in the 1960's was conducted primarily in a *crisis-response* style. The 1960's was a decade of crisis and the ecumenism of the church's mission was developed in response to crisis. Much that was helpful both for the church and the community resulted from this ecumenical crisis mission style. It is now clear, however, that this crisis-response style let the church in the 1960's respond much too promiscuously to the *community's agenda.* Crisis-response as an operating style is more appropriate to the fire department than to the church.

The church cannot do mission adequately unless it has a strategy for determining its priorities. The church must now find the way to be faithful to its own various traditions and constituencies even while developing its own manageable agenda for the community and determining ways to press that agenda in the public life of the city. What constitutes a manageable agenda for the church? The 1960's have surely shown us something like the following criteria:

a. The church must be capable of doing the mission task undertaken;

b. The Biblical claims of justice should inform the setting of tasks;

c. Mission efforts should seek to penetrate and to change the major systems of the metropolitan areas;

d. Mission activities must attempt to demonstrate the possibilities of new strategies or systems alternative to existing forms;

e. A continuous mechanism for evaluation should accompany all undertakings in mission.

The church in the 1970's should not make uncritical alliances with the national administration. In the years of the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations, the church's mission was often an affirmation of the various secular programs mounted by those administrations. The current national administration provides the church with the opportunity to become faithful, to develop its critical and prophetic functions vis-a-vis society and to nurture its own constituencies in the strengths required to cope with and to advocate change. Instead of climbing aboard the Poverty Program in the 1970's the church has the opportunity to

find ways to create alternative structures, parallel to but distinct from existing systems. The same distance from the secular order that prophecy requires provides the church with the freedom to break fresh ground in the search for systems capable of nourishing the whole of the human community.

The development of group or cluster ministries as a strategy for the denominations has demonstrated anew the *primacy of the congregation or parish as the basic mission unit.* The group ministry strategy has enabled the church to abandon its often frenetic efforts to do mission to some constituency other than its own by identifying groups of local congregations and their geographical communities as the initial context for mission. The group ministry strategy must, however, be accompanied by a coordination of mission in a metropolitan-wide context in order that the church avoid a retreat into parochialism.

The mission styles and strategies developed by the religious community in the 1960's provided it with an unusually high level of trust and confidence. The creation of formal and informal processes, and the enabling style that came to characterize the various interreligious staff people, provided the kind of unity which respected various denominational differences, yet often permitted the religious community to speak and to act in concert. The military chaplaincies have operated for years with this kind of spirit. Perhaps the single most valuable aspect of the church's mission in the 1960's was the trust and the confidence engendered among the various denominations in their common endeavors. Building on that accumulation of trust in the 1970's, the religious communities must affirm each denomination's traditions and uniqueness more creatively. The whole religious enterprise in this area must seek new ways to realize its own diversity, its multiplicity of traditions, the great differences in the various expressions of its life. This is particularly, but by no means exclusively true with regard to Black-White relationships. The differences which abound within the religious community are *assets,* not liabilities. Ecumenism, or, better, interreligious activity which seeks to serve the entire human community in this place, is made vigorous by the various and different traditions which are affirmed and not denied in the building of a Metropolitan Mission.

I believe that out of our experience in the 1960's and with careful reflection on the nature of the Gospel and the church, some new or at least clearer impressions of the religious community are both possible and needful. If we are to ask what next for the church, then some descriptions of the church and its life

style in the coming decade are in order. Insofar as it is possible to look ahead I regard the church in three principle ways:

1. What it must know itself to be.
2. How it must consciously style itself.
3. What it must proclaim.

1. The church of the near future must know itself to be the "only unity which does not bear the seeds of its own destruction." [2] The church thus must be "the unity of justice and caring for one another." [3] The church must understand itself in the context of justice and injustice. It must always come down hard on the side of the oppressed, the powerless, the pariahs of society. Those men who are ground up by the very system which they themselves create must find the church not as a part of the system or a mirror image of it, but as the body of faithful people who choose deliberately to stand apart from any ideological or functioning unit of man's self-designed socio-economic or political apparatus. This is not to say that the church is not made up of the very same men who create the system which oppresses. It is to say that as these men come together in expression of the unity which the Word and Sacraments create in their midst, they do so consciously proclaiming justice for themselves as well as for the world. "The church must always witness to the limitations of any given society." [4]

The church must also see itself as the unity of deep caring for one another. Roman society, reflecting on the early church, said, "See how they love one another," which is precisely how the church must be seen and must see itself. The determining factor should be whether we do or do not care for one another. It is the church's constant task to find man worth loving and to practice that love far beyond self service because "he first loved us." The task of finding man worth loving is not an easy one. There are, however, some clues given to us, in addition to the examples of Jesus, by the youth of our day who at least try love first. As Charles A. Reich points out: "Older people are inclined to think of work, injustice and war, and of the bitter frustrations of life as the human conditions." [5] To the youth of affluent America, however, the Consciousness III people, "the discrepancy between what is and what could be is overwhelming." [6] It has recently been pointed out that our children not only accept what we have taught them in Sunday School but are also trying to

---

[2] Wolfart Pannenberg, *Theology and the Kingdom of God* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1969) p. 79.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 79.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 83.
[5] "The Greening of America," *The New Yorker*, Sept. 26, 1970.
[6] *Ibid.*

live that way. The great sin is that the church never really conducted itself as though it expected anyone to "love his neighbor as himself."

This is not some naive polemic on behalf of the flower children. It is a plea for the church to try love first. Too often the life style of the church has mirrored the standards applied to employees by employers, for example, rather than to seek another more acceptable "Jesus style" pattern for working through interpersonal problems in congregational life. The imbalance that has all too often occurred which causes our critics to say that we love *things* before *people* in the church is a direct result of our willingness to take the time to care for one another and indeed for ourselves. The church stands to gain significantly in its understanding of "love your neighbor as yourself" as it learns from the self-identity movements which are currently with us and surely will continue. "Black is beautiful" is translatable into "I am beautiful" by the Christian who grasps God's love for him as well as for his neighbor.

2. The word *renewal* has found so much usage in the church of the past decade that one hesitates to use it. Yet, short of using an even more worn-out phrase, "Ye must be born again," there is hardly a better word. Friends have pressed me to define what I mean by "renewal" in the church. I have attempted a definition: RENEWAL is to seek to disestablish the church to the point where it is no longer a mirror-image reflection of the society or culture in which it finds itself, but is known by its contemporaries as that body of people faithful to the Word who are characterized chiefly by their concern for justice in the world and their care for one another.

Given that definition the question is, How should the church consciously style itself? One can begin on any level. The churches in America, for example, should come to the conclusion that their large corporation image must be discarded, if genuine renewal is desired. In the place of their constitutions, guidelines, compartmentalization and American management design, they must develop the style of a matrix organization in which the glue is much more akin to love for one another and common concern for the people of the world.

In the case of the single congregation, the style of the church can best be seen. The congregational life style itself is a proclamation of the Gospel. Working with concepts of shared leadership, government by consensus, authority by competence rather than position, and covenanted commitment, the congregation can become a model of social creativity which clearly states to the community around it: "You see, *people* always come first, there

are no stations in life more important than others, affirming life is our business, and death has no dominion over us." This is what proclaiming release to the captives is all about. And herein is found the catholicity of the church. In a recent issue of *Dialog,* Rosemary Reuther makes this point very strongly: "We must take seriously the New Testament concept of the church as a fellowship in which each member's gift is taken into account and all have a ministry for the edification of the whole body. We conclude that only the most communal and participatory form would really be in keeping with the church's nature."

3. Hope is the power of the future to break the determinism of the past. This is what the church must proclaim. This is the Gospel. The Christian man is informed by his past and defined by his future. I know much about myself because of where I have been; I know who I am because of where I am going, but the horizon which God constantly holds before me is my raison d'etre.

Holding this proclamation, the church constantly seeks to reconcile and redeem. Its confessions and practices, which of necessity reflect its past proclamation, must lend themselves to the test of that which is now being proclaimed. Insofar as the past proclamation has been hopeful, to that extent, and to that extent only, will those confessions and practices remain. I am not here suggesting a radical house-cleaning with an all-powerful vacuum cleaner (or as my critics would claim, throwing the baby out with the bath water), but rather a careful and deliberate process of setting priorities and objectives vis-a-vis that which the church has to deliver to the world in order to be the church.

In this "careful and deliberate" process we must be conscious of the fact that the way we go about doing things in the church is perhaps our most powerful proclamation in the world. If the world sees us concerned only with achieving, while people—especially the youth, the aged, blacks, third world, women and others—are neglected or overlooked in the process, then no matter what we proclaim when we reach the goal for which we have striven, the world will hear a distorted proclamation not unlike the one we have left behind. If on the other hand the church consciously chooses new mechanisms and processes to renew itself, in which all are clearly given opportunity to be heard and affirmation of their faithfulness is celebrated, then perhaps the world will hear and see a *proclamation of hope.* This is not a new concept. The concept of the "people of God" being set apart, being different, being socially creative in a land of no creativity, had its origins in God's engagement with Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and Moses.

Having these brief descriptions of the church in mind, we find that it is now necessary and possible to do some things about our mission together in this decade. "The church's relationship to the world is determinative of her authentic vocation." [7] The church is not a small and imperfect sample of the kingdom of God existing as an island in the world. It is very much by its "sacramental community with Jesus" the one body among men which makes it possible for contemporary man to share hope for the ultimate fulfillment of humanity.

I want you to know that I find *hope* in the church today. That hope can, I believe, be expressed in a task definition. Yet, before looking at the task before us more specifically, I find I must share with you some things about the style of ministry in the contemporary world vis-a-vis three basic assumptions, anthropological, theological and ecclesiological, which I have accepted.

A contemporary liturgy used on occasion in Washington, D.C., includes the following prayer:

> O Christ, who sets us in accordance with and in opposition to our brothers and the structures of society;
> We go out to shoulder the burden of our task this week.
> May we put our whole lives into our mission, regardless of outside opposition, our psychological frustrations, our suffering and our condemnation from within and without ourselves.
> Grant us a tenaciousness that will not let go until the final battle closes, and the nonchalance of recognizing that the final battle does not depend upon our existence.
> May we act with a power as if the destiny of all life depended upon us, but with the detachment of knowledge that nothing we do lasts.
> Amen.

The life style suggested by this collect is very much the life style suggested by Jesus as he gave instructions to the seventy to "carry no purse, no bag, no sandals." It is the style of ministry which is clearly suggested by the foregoing descriptions of the church. It is a style which I would like to discuss—anthropologically, theologically and ecclesiologically. I believe this will lead us to some understanding of ministry in the contemporary world.

THE ANTHROPOLOGICAL ASSUMPTION

> "In our time, what is at issue is the very nature of man, the image we have of his limits and possibilities as man. History is not yet done with its exploration of the limits and meanings of human nature." [8]

---

[7] Pannenberg, *op. cit.*, p. 72.

[8] C. Wright Mills, *The Sociological Imagination* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1959) p. 171.

A few probes into church life quickly lead a person into a whole host of anthropological problems. Our experience in the Lutheran congregations in Metropolitan Washington over the past five years clearly indicates that we have a very bad, a non-Christian, anthropology going for us. Average Lutherans in the pew have a Hellenistic, Greek substantialist or static view of man. They have been taught this view by the average Lutheran clergyman who has persisted in teaching "medieval and Enlightenment" philosophies. To the contrary the new anthropologists (called by some, fittingly, the new hope anthropologists) seem to be saying a much more Christian thing about man. Man is spoken of in terms of his participation in a distinctly human order of meaning in which "we are coming to recognize that we are primarily agents, that we are originally and constitutively engaged in a whole complex of relationships." [9] To be human is essentially—and not accidentally, as in the classical perspective—to exist with others." [10]

One can easily understand why it is difficult for our "ministers" to embrace freedom as a life style, and as a goal for congregational life, if they persist—as they do—with the Lockian understanding of freedom. This idea of the mechanical molecule possessed of freedom, yielding up "pieces" of freedom for the common good, is absolutely inconsistent with the concept of the church as the Body of Christ, the communion of saints, the fellowship of believers. "In contemporary thought, freedom is thoroughly social, not individual." [11]

A primary ministry of the church is the ministry of bringing the saints to a clear understanding of their humanity. Only when that understanding is clear, only when it is consciously and joyously embraced, is it possible to speak of the church in ministry to the contemporary world with the joyous proclamation that "the truth will make you free." The freedom which is spoken of here is in direct opposition to the current American understanding of man which is best seen in the "possessive individualism" illustrated by Professor Crawford B. MacPherson.[12]

1. Man is free and human by virtue of his sole proprietorship of his own person.

2. Human society is essentially a series of market relationships. Social and political institutions are accidental, because the individual is essentially asocial: they exist for the sake of

[9] Lee J. Monroe, "Toward a Political Theology," *Listening*, Autumn, 1969.
[10] *Ibid.*
[11] *Ibid.*
[12] *The Political Theory of Possessive Individualism: Hobbes to Locke* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1962) p. 270.

accidental benefits they provide to individual members of society.

3. Possessive market society is a series of competitive and invasive relations between all men, regardless of class: it puts every man on his own.

It is also clear to this Christian that the same liberal assumptions underlie most of traditional Christian social teaching.

A ministry thus dealing with this deep anthropological problem would of necessity be highly political. An awareness that the source of personal problems is connected with the functioning of larger social structures, and the destruction of the myth that public issues are nearly always an unrelated series of private problems—together with the de-privitizing of man's redemption—will make it possible for the church, the congregation, to be an institution or ministry for purposeful creative change.[13]

Thus a prime ministry of the church will be that of building models of social creativity—always beginning with itself, its own institutions. For example, rather than exhort the members of our congregations to write or march on the State legislature so that 18 year olds might vote, we ought to have been about the business of building a socially creative model of what we believe by the "careful and deliberate" process of bringing about the inclusion of all baptized members into the total life of our congregations and institutions. To do this, the aforementioned anthropological issues would have to be dealt with by the astute application of the Gospel, an understanding of what is just, the eucharistic building of community and the fostering of deep love for one another. Army chaplains must apply these same concepts to their lives and ministries and to the kinds of "congregations" they serve.

The process of thus politicizing the church spells out a whole host of other "renewals." Out of the window goes the church's mirror-image of American republicanism—representative government. Out of the window goes our highly dubious reliance on the Holy Spirit to select proper leadership, the ecclesiastical ballot. Out of the window goes hierarchical leadership and the common complaint of the clergy that they feel like yo-yos playing the favorite congregational game of "on and off the pedestal, pastor."

Outside the church, and I take this to be the reason for the basic mandate, it will be possible for a thus politicized body of saints to minister by "promulgating historical alternatives for

[13] Karl Rahner, "The Theology of Hope," *Theology Digest*, Sesquicentennial Issue, 1968.

creating new social structures for the promotion of justice, peace, freedom and creative responsibility." [14]

THE THEOLOGICAL ASSUMPTION

"The Christian must increasingly be characterized as a man of hope." [15] In the same probing among the Lutheran congregations over the past five years which gave us our anthropological opinions, we have acquired some theological insight. As a part and parcel of the anthropological problem of man as a private unit who functions in a series of "market relationships," we have stumbled on a deep theological problem. It is the problem of *death*. If you wish, the problem of *existence*. Most of our ministries to our own members and to the world to which we are sent not only sidestep the issue, but indeed deal with death by glossing over it and providing substitute modes of living which are unreal. We baptize the avoidance of death while participating in a society which deals daily with its own members in a deadly fashion.

The example which first comes to mind is the much worried over edifice complex of the church. Worried over for the wrong reason, perhaps. I believe we can gather sufficient socio-psychological evidence to show that groups of people build their own security—such as in a large, well-appointed suburban church building—precisely so that the central message of the Gospel, namely, death and resurrection, need not be clearly expressed or heard. As I observe our contemporary ministers I am convinced that to "preach Christ crucified" is absolute folly in most of our congregations and consequently is seldom seriously attempted.

I am now open to the charge that I am advocating a return (if that is the direction) to simply preaching that Jesus loves me and letting the world deal with the problems of humanity.

Indeed, the above conclusions were impossible for me until Moltmann, Metz, Rahner and Pannenberg came along.

> No doubt there is emphasis on the individual in the New Testament. We might even say that it is the gist of the message—especially in the Pauline expression—to place the individual before God. When we insist on deprivatizing we do not in the least object to this orientation. On the contention that theology, precisely because of its privatizing tendency, is apt to miss the individual in his real existence. Today this existence is to a great extent entangled in social vicissitudes; so that any existential and personal theology that does not understand existence as a political problem in the widest sense of

[14] Monroe, *op. cit.*
[15] *Ibid.*

the word must inevitably restrict its considerations to an abstraction.[16]

It should be evident that I am calling for a political theology which will make coming contemporary ministries possible. Fr. Lee J. Monroe spells this out very directly:

> It is the task of political theology to give historical content to Christian hope both by genuine social critique of present structures and institutions and the proposal of historical alternatives.[17]

The ministries which are suggested to me as I consider a theology which deals with death in terms of that which is to come and which marks the experience of things hoped for are ministries, once again, characterized by justice and deep caring for one another. In the years which are to come, the existence of man will constantly be in question (this is surely the case today); to minister to that question is to speak of death hopefully and to show alternatives to the ordering of society which proclaim hope for human fulfillment. The church has largely forgotten that she is a pilgrim people and that the journey is one of bright promise and daily delight.

THE ECCLESIOLOGICAL ASSUMPTION

When I speak of the church as an institution, my first thought goes to the primary communities of hope which we know as congregations. This gathering of faithful people around the Word and Eucharist is the church. Basically, we (US 20th century Christians) have known only one style of that gathering of the faithful. Indeed we have so narrowed our view as to assume, for a time at least, that only this one style was good or possible. Hence the flourishing of common hymnals, model constitutions, guidelines for action, package missions, typical architecture, and program manuals, etc., all conceived in and born of the same bureaucratic womb which in cyclical fashion was created to support this flourishing. This is the worst kind of ecclesiology for it distorts the very nature of the Spirit which calls the people together, it assumes a false unity, and finally it denies the Creator by denying the true nature of the creature.

Contemporary ministries, as in the military, must cease to be overly concerned with form and structure. The balance between the maintenance task of the institution and the purpose task of the church must be struck anew. It must be the balance of a gypsy wagon—just enough grease to keep the wheels rolling, just enough hay for the horse (remembering that grass grows merci-

[16] Johannes B. Metz, *Theology of the World* (New York: Herder & Herder, 1969) pp. 107–140; see also Jurgen Moltmann, *Theology of Hope* (New York: Harper & Row, 1967) p. 310.
[17] Monroe, *op. cit.*

fully along each road side) and some twine to hold the canvas top together. Pilgrims, indeed. I ask you to think of the proclamation of this kind of institution. A proclamation of hope and alternatives—justice and love. The institutional church must be socially creative—never absolute. Pilgriming makes social creativity not only possible, but essential.

My heavy emphasis on the primary gathered community is deliberate. I believe theologically that the catholicity of the church is found here and I believe practically that every minister needs an altar, a table of the Lord around which he gathers with fellow ministers. In Washington we have clearly seen that those clergy who were assigned "Street Ministries" of varying sorts while maintaining a functional relationship with a gathered body on at least a weekly basis have "success"; this has not been true for those clergy who did not have this functional relationship with an eucharistic community.

I am not denying the necessity of probing into new forms of ministry which could not be described as congregations. I am insisting that all who minister *need a primary community.* Thus the new probes must have their origin in congregations which are local to the scene of ministry rather than being sponsored by boards or agencies removed from the point of mission entry. You can apply this to various types of ministries within the military better than I can.

The expression of the church beyond congregational life (districts, synods, national bodies) must come in response to real felt need on the part of the congregations. The national church, its institutions and agencies, must serve the primary communities in a way which in itself is socially creative. The institutional church, in its organization and management areas, must be seen as transitory—only a step toward the unfolding future.

There is much more to be said for unity in diversity, embracing plurality, shared leadership, discovery of community, the impact of the future on extant styles of congregational life, etc., but I do believe this had to be said first:

> To be contemporaneous the church must be a model of social creativity, proclaiming hope to the totality of mankind, pushing on to the ultimate fulfillment of humanity—God.

Being a model of social creativity; proclaiming hope to all mankind; pushing on to man's fulfillment—how might we do that in Metropolitan Washington or in the military? What is the task ahead?

The experience of the last several years has begun to expose the inadequacy of our assumptions about suburban churches and their ministry. The religious boom of the 50's is over. Loss of church membership and financial resources is now felt acutely in the suburbs, as well as in the city. Racial tensions, the disaffection of the young, the rise of extremist groups—these have stripped away the Arcadian myth in which we had bathed our descriptions of suburban life. In this context, the church must begin to shape a new suburban mission strategy around two major questions:

1. What is the nature of the church's responsibility for pastoral care, not merely to individuals, but to large groups of people as well?

2. What are the appropriate and faithful ways in which the church may help to critique and shape the public policy issues of the communities of which they are a part?

Given these questions I feel that the following task descriptions should receive priority attention:

1. The church in suburbia lacks both organization and special competence in understanding the political, social, and economic dynamics of the communities in which it is present. Such competence is needed to affect public policy and to press for an examination of the Bibical claims of justice at the key points of decision-making. The church needs competent persons to keep abreast of current issues of local importance, to research important policy issues, to provide the church with access to the main decision-making bodies of the county (Council, Board of Education, Planning Commission, etc.) and to coordinate the efforts of various group and cluster ministries within their jurisdiction. Only with such competence, together with the specialized skills of lay leadership, can the churches hope to give effective leadership in the arena of public affairs in suburbia.

2. In addition to providing pastoral care to individuals and families, the suburban church should begin to develop strategies for pastoral ministries to powerless groups of people as well, (the poor, the elderly, the young, racial minorities, ethnic groups). There is great need for effective communications and human relations skills to minister at the points of conflict in community life where tension is highest—conflict between racial groups, between young and old, between haves and have nots.

During the past few years, group and cluster ministries have grown throughout Metropolitan Washington. In the suburbs this

has been a first tentative step towards developing new structures for mission planning and implementation.

Little attention heretofore has been given to the developmental process of these cluster ministries. I recommend that this developmental process receive priority attention during the next years, so that all parts of the church system, including pastors, lay leadership, congregational structures, judicatories, and the communities in which churches serve, may work together to develop a style of ministry appropriate to each community. The military needs to look at these same problems.

I realize that I have not given you a clear task definition. Perhaps I have pointed more to a *style of ministry* than to detailed job descriptions. Our discussion might lead us to be more specific. I wanted you to know that although the task is monumental, I am hopeful for the church. That hopefulness is couched in the conviction that we can be the socially creative people of God who care deeply for one another and for all men whom we encounter. The church is the community of hope, wherever it exists—in civilian or military life. Our community concern must be expressed hopefully.

SOCIAL CONCERN FROM A POST CHAPLAIN'S VIEWPOINT

Chaplain (COL) Emil F. Kapusta

There is little room for doubt that social concern and social action are closely related to any meaningful religious program. A study of the Jewish faith, the historic background of Christianity, shows a strong emphasis on concern for fellowman and a family-type relationship of fidelity that attempted to assure the welfare of everyone in the community. Early Christian groups in Jerusalem were also communities of concerned people. The history of the Jewish-Christian faith is studded with examples. Social concern was not always the primary interest, but it was always present.

The early 20th Century found the Protestant Church deeply involved in an emphasis on the "Social Gospel." While it is obvious that the church was not completely successful in meeting social problems, there is no question today that social concern is essential to contemporary Christian or Jewish religious expressions. The degree may be debatable, but the fact seems inescapable.

What follows is an overview of the thoughts of chaplains at Fort Carson regarding social action. In some instances, I have used words of individual chaplains; in other cases, I have summarized their basic ideas.

1. *What is Social Action?*

The phrase *social action* has many interpretations within religious and secular communities. By *social action* do we mean that the Kingdom of God will be created by the labor of men? Do we mean that to be a Christian a person must take off his coat, roll up his sleeves, and work in slums, prisons and hospitals? Or is it sufficient for him to become involved by voting, by staying informed, and by giving of his wealth? I am not really sure where the "Social Gospel" and the "Christian Gospel" diverge.

Chaplain Kapusta is currently assigned as Staff Chaplain, Headquarters MACV. He was assigned as Post Chaplain at Fort Carson from 15 July 71 to 6 July 72.

I do know, however, that those who would interpret each message very often disagree.

It is the opinion of one writer that Biblical revelation and Biblical Christian faith are unique—different from every other competing faith, whether that faith be philosophical, theological, or religious. That uniqueness is based on the heavy Biblical emphasis on the concept of a God who *speaks and acts.* This emphasis demands that those who are faithful witnesses to the Biblical Christian faith also must emphasize both words and action. To have a Christian faith which will pass the test of Biblical revelation, therefore, one must both profess and act. Consequently, the chaplain's ministry must not be an excessively one-sided emphasis on the verbal, homiletical, theoretical, and evangelistic dimensions of faith. It must also involve a practicing, working dimension as well.

In order for the contemporary church to meet the needs of modern man, it should interpret the Gospel in a way that allows for and encourages social action, but at the same time does not force any pet social action project on people as a requisite for, or validation of, church membership. The chaplain has an obligation to enlarge the vision of his people so that they are aware of social action opportunities, for there is no real expression of Christian conviction unless it is demonstrated in action—in what a person or group does, thinks, and leads others to do or think.

2. *To what extent, then, should the Chapel Program get involved in Social Action?*

There is no simple answer to this question. The chapel (parish) should have an interest in any situation involving human need. Social consciousness, social problems, and social reform concern everyone because they affect the society in which everyone lives. The prudent chaplain will direct and guide his parishoners in those action programs which will serve and meet the needs of human beings, particularly the needs of the community in which they are living. This means he will attempt to create a social awareness and consciousness where there is little or none. His sermons and talks will include discussions of social problems and reforms. He will organize and motivate for action.

Although parish programs should involve social action, they should not attempt to supersede social agencies already in existence, since this would unnecessarily multiply or duplicate effort. They should *complement* or *supplement* rather than *supplant.* They should attempt to meet those needs of the community which are not already being met.

Every crisis presents an opportunity to confirm or deny a relationship with Christ. Many soldiers in crisis situations have their first contact with the church and the caring community through the church's action programs. If our brother stands in need of food, clothing, or help of any kind, it becomes our responsibility to assist him—directly or indirectly.

The Christian must be a leader in social action. The day of the church as the *primary* social agency is past, however. The drain of finances and personnel have made it impossible for the church to compete. This is not to say that the church and the individual Christian should not be knowledgeable and concerned. The church, as an agent of Christ, must continue to prick the conscience of the church member to be active. The church must be a prophet crying out against injustice and poverty, challenging the membership to action. They key word here is *action* coupled with *Judaeo-Christian,* because the church leavens secular society with "God-pleasing" values which enoble human life.

A planned program, however, is a prerequisite to desired action. Hence our parishes must organize and plan for action. Laity and chaplains need to do more than just let it happen; they need to plan the action and carry it out together.

It may make us feel comfortable that the Army has organizations to meet social needs, but the truth is that these organizations have had to do so much because the chapel program has not been involved, and because some chaplains have been content to preach and teach in a vacuum.

3. *How deeply should chaplains get involved in Social Action?*

Fort Carson chaplains responded variously to this question as follows:

a. Chaplains should be resource men, cognizant of the agencies and professions equipped to handle various social problems. They should be a "referral" agency for the command (parish).

b. The chaplain is a pastor. He should be a prophet, a leader. If he does not lead, the flock will find its own way and for lack of guidance go over the cliff rather than remain safely beside "reality" and "truth."

c. Chaplain involvement in social and community concerns should be in accordance with military regulations and should not be of a controversial nature. Chaplains should not be involved in enterprises of a political nature or in those which are at variance with the laws and customs of American society. Otherwise, their well-intentioned efforts could become counter-productive, and could tend to contravene the basic principles of religion.

d. The chaplain should support those programs which clearly alleviate human suffering, and he should encourage his lay people to do such work in the local community.

e. Some chaplains may be led by their theological perspectives to pay only scant attention to social action. They may never want to participate in any activity that they feel is "just secular." Other chaplains will have a natural inclination to work in this area, and they should be encouraged to do so, relating their activity to the *Gospel*, and demonstrating the motivation of their social concern. Thus the charge of being a "mere social worker" will be rejected.

f. Because of chaplains' great diversity in ability and inclination for involvement, some may naturally prefer specialized work in the area of social action. The Post Chaplain has a positive and urgent responsibility to ascertain the gifts and talents of each chaplain and to use those men most suited to perform the more demanding socially oriented programs.

g. Because the chaplain himself is a "professing" person, he too must be involved in social action. He cannot afford the luxury of being only a cheerleader-catalyst for the faithful.

4. *To what extent should lay members of the military community or parish be involved?*

All members of a parish should be involved in a coordinated program of social welfare and community concern. The parish, as a religious entity, should work with other denominations. Relief of suffering is common to all denominations and could be a point of convergence of ecumenical effort. We should delineate needs and encourage our people to assist in meeting these needs. Social involvement can help keep the fire in spiritual life. Our people must be encouraged to give of their time, their talents, and their tithes.

We should involve our parish in social action to the extent that this action allows the full expression of the faith which it professes. The church must be like the Christ who formed it, the God who sustains it, and the Biblical Revelation which nurtures and disciplines it. It must both speak and act in society. Because the chaplain attempts to speak—to translate the speech and action of God—he must challenge the people who hear him to be involved in speech and action.

Our people can be involved in social welfare and community concerns through cooperation with the local Council of Churches and through working as volunteers in community agencies. Problem matters should be brought to the attention of chaplains and lay leaders of our military congregations.

There are so many specific areas in which the chaplain and members of his parish could be involved that no list can be complete. There are, however, several general areas, any one of which could be a beginning point from which a Post Chaplain might start to direct the efforts of the chaplains and the people of the military parish:

a. The general area of welfare work. The relationship of the chaplaincy to agencies such as Army Community Service still needs clarification.

b. Hospital religious programming. Chaplains are becoming increasingly professional in this area, but there is still room for improvement.

c. Special needs of people which spring from illness in the family, temporary disability, and other human problems.

d. Youth activities for high school and college people. Much that is now being done in this area is being done by lay people because religious efforts have been too little and too late.

5. *Conclusion*

Social concern and response are essential in any real religious program. It should be obvious that they then must exist in any post religious program, and that the Post Chaplain must be involved. The qualifications of available chaplains must be recognized. Any program must be enlightened by the recognition of the individual chaplain's religious background; therefore, it must be voluntary. The chaplain's task is to translate real concern into sensible activity.

SOCIAL CONCERNS

Chaplain (LTC) John W. Hulme

The parish should be a vital part of the military community. Its importance is not seriously questioned by knowledgeable people. How adequately any parish is performing, however, is a worthwhile question for all who sincerely wish to be involved in challenging people to build a better community. It is this concern for significant ministry that should cause chaplains to focus their attention on social concerns, without, of course, neglecting other valid areas of ministry. They should be able to analyze their social environment and determine their legitimate concerns. An underlying assumption should be that chaplains are reasonably informed on current social issues.

With what social concerns *should* the military parish be involved? How can chaplains most effectively contribute to meaningful, responsible social action? It will be helpful to focus attention on several areas of concern:

1. Communication between social classes, races, and other groups that are being polarized by issues such as law and order, sex education in public schools, etc. The military parish can serve as an enabler, catalyst and stimulator of meaningful encounter between diverse groups and conflicting interests. To do so the chaplain must be bold, imaginative, and accepting; he must not be intimidated.

2. Drug and Alcohol Abuse. Most chaplains are on the drug and alcohol abuse bandwagon; they constantly sound off about drugs and alcohol. The more one becomes involved with plans and programs to deal with these problems, however, the more one questions the long-range value of some military crash programs for rehabilitating addicts. Until chaplains take seriously and deal conscientiously with the *causes* for drug and alcohol abuse, they will be committing most of their resources to isolated

---

Chaplain Hulme is currently assigned as Staff Chaplain, USMACT/JUSMAGT, Bangkok, Thailand. At the time of the conference he was Assistant Staff Chaplain for Active Duty Training, USCONARC. In order to arouse the conference to face hot issues, he purposely raised some concrete controversial issues which enabled the conferees to deal with the question of how far we should go in the area of social concerns.

battles that, if won, will contribute little to the overall campaign of creating a better society.

3. Creation of a society that encourages and sustains a sense of personal worth and human dignity. Chaplains have the capacity for self-delusion which enables them to boast of their charity and social concern—as they deny the recipients thereof even the illusion of pride or dignity. Every congregation, however, *can* begin creating a "whole" society. What it takes is love, compassion, concern and someone to lead or motivate. Chaplains should endorse and reinforce efforts to engender pride and self-motivation in people, and they should also engage in person-to-person efforts to change lives. Chaplains have given lip service to this idea for many years; seldom have even a few taken it seriously. Too often *things* are far more important than *people.*

4. Involvement in community awareness. Study programs can be conducted to make parishioners knowledgeable about efforts designed to improve the quality of life. Some of the programs for assisting the economically deprived are poorly administered and tend to destroy the thin veil of human dignity yet left to the poor. Many community leaders are not well informed about federal and state aid programs. Teams could be made available to schools, civic groups or any agency interested in helping its people become informed citizens. In addition, many parishioners are qualified to serve the community as sources of information.

5. Sex Education. Sex education has too often been a neglected area of concern. The intimate nature of human sexual experience often causes individuals and groups to deny any public responsibility. The church has long accepted its general pastoral responsibility to families. It has avoided, however, its specific responsibility for helping the family to understand the nature, beauty and joy of God-ordained sexuality. Sex education should, therefore, become a normal, natural part of any comprehensive training program provided by the parish council. It can be effectively programmed for all levels of education provided for family enrichment.

6. Homosexuality. Homosexuality is an increasingly serious social problem. Miss Phyllis Loyon and the Reverend Tom Maurer of the Glide Urban Center in San Francisco stated in the November/December issue of *Spectrum* that there are 20 million homosexual men and women in our country—all of whom are *human beings.* There are more homosexuals than there are drug and alcohol addicts combined. Yet the church has ignored the problem and the people. Do chaplains dare extend the circle of

Christian love to include these men and women who are now unwelcome and usually ostracized by all elements of our society?

7. War and Peace. The average citizen should be better informed concerning his responsibilities in the family of nations. Without a well-informed citizenry, America can become a divided, weak nation. Self-serving groups with articulate spokesmen can successfully polarize society. Religious groups can provide an unthreatening atmosphere for free discussion of any issues which may arise. The issues of war and peace should be revived once more at a time when there is a possibility of producing more light than heat.

8. Amnesty for draft evaders. The immediate response of most military people is that this is a political issue. It certainly is. In a more important sense, however, it is a social and moral issue. Today many of our people feel that Vietnam was a mistake. If it is true that we erred, then we must deal with the moral issue of individual freedom to obey conscience. Can our society use draft evaders as scapegoats to obtain a clean conscience? This is an issue to be explored by intelligent, mature people. Dare we leave such an important issue to the gladiators of the political arena? Dare we as responsible religious mentors ignore a question of such far-reaching moral import?

CONFERENCE CONCLUSIONS

1. Chaplains should be made aware that social action programs are most effective when they are nurtured by a definite fellowship of believers.

2. Despite the transient nature of the military ministry, chaplains should be urged to develop nurturing fellowships rather than merely gathering audiences of isolated people.

3. Attacks on social problems should be made using the most tactically productive timing and means. (The sermon may not be the most salutary medium for addressing complex problems.)

4. While a one-to-one prophetic ministry continues to be of value, the changing nature of society calls for more emphasis on corporate prophecy authorized by a committed community.

5. An ecumenical chaplain collegium should be developed as concurrent support to individual chaplains engaging in social action work.

6. Chaplains should address themselves to the problems of middle America—its fragmentation, alienation and frustration. These are represented visibly in the NCO and middle manager who must be given a new sense of identity and purpose. Without this effort the emerging social conflict may make useless other attempts to minister.

7. Chaplains should be advised that the best credentials for a prophetic ministry in the area of social concern is the credibility of their pastoral ministry.

8. The failure of chaplains to engage in social action is not primarily caused by restrictive regulations or a static system but by a lack of deft utilization of regulations and system. Part of this failure is a lack of knowledge about the use of power structures in both military and civilian communities.

9. Chaplains should be urged to institute programs in areas where other agencies are not getting to the vital issues. Some examples are the following:

a. Trailer court ministries.

b. "Blue Lady" ministries in VA hospitals.

c. Ministries to sudden impact death situations.

d. Ministry to families of prisoners.

e. Starting schools, kindergartens or classes in needed areas for deprived persons.

f. Drug/Alcohol programs for sections of the population not touched by other programs.

g. Conduct informal surveys in critical areas to determine the extent of problems. Care should be taken to keep these informal, confidential and for use only as chaplain tools.

10. Chaplains should be warned of the following dangers in social actions:

a. Seeming to favor one group over another.

b. Seeming to favor only one style of ministry.

c. Being overconcerned about trivialities while not facing the real issue.

d. Failing to represent the denominations which endorse them.

e. Engaging in stop-gap or palliative actions without also being willing to wrestle with the underlying problems.

f. Faulty thinking which equates all change with progress.

BOOK REVIEWS

PERSONALITY AND CHRISTIAN FAITH

Lowell G. Colston and Paul E. Johnson
Nashville: Abingdon, 1972

The authors have a twofold purpose in this book: "(1) to acknowledge and affirm the contemporary revolution in personal consciousness and to contribute in some measure to it; (2) to reaffirm our view that Christian faith, in spirit and by intent, is a potential source of vitality and perspective for that revolution."

The relevance of this book for community concerns, although not readily apparent in its title, begins to emerge when the authors define personality as the "dynamic mutual interaction of all systems which comprise and affect the organism." These systems include the physical, social, economic, political, and ecological. Its relevance for community concerns becomes especially apparent in the last two chapters where they discuss the Christian vocation in terms of caring for persons and the interaction of personal and community transformation.

The book is divided into three sections: first, Revolution in Personal Consciousness; second, Expansion of Personal Consciousness; and third, Consciousness and Faith. The chaplain who has found something of value for his ministry in the writings of such men as Reinhold Niebuhr, Viktor Frankl, Abraham Maslow, Erik Erickson, Theodore Roszak, Alvin Toffler and Charles Reich will be delighted to discover in this book a unified description of personality development and consciousness which is related to achieving mature personhood from a Christian perspective.

Christian personal consciousness is the central theme of this book. The development of this consciousness, according to Colston and Johnson, is the *sine qua non* for social action, the basic factor involved in solving the fundamental problem of modern man—alienation. However important and necessary it is to make institutional changes in society, the solution to man's problems lies deeper than in the institutional structure; it lies within the

personality of man. This is where the revolution must come and this is where the Christian faith is a potential source of vitality and perspective.

The last paragraph epitomizes the authors' views on social involvement:

"We believe that the changing world view draws vitality and energy from hope generated by Christian faith. Faith which sees man's possiblities in a dying and rising Lord, who cannot be restrained by systems or defeated even by death, is the essential core of a liberating and facilitating community. Such a community embodies that faith—gives it concrete expression through its own incarnation. We are the body of Christ. Then let us truly be such a body! Let us sensitize our persons to each other and overcome this fatal alienation in the world. In the household of God we are no longer strangers, sojourners, or aliens, but fellow citizens."

THE SACRED CANOPY

Peter L. Berger
Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1969

This is neither a new book nor one which speaks directly to the matter of social actions and concerns. It is, however, an extremely important and seminal work in the field of the Sociology of Religion. As such it is necessary reading prior to discussions on particular issues of church involvement.

Berger's definition of religion, for sociological purposes, makes religion a human projection in which a sacred "world" comes into being. He describes the way in which the sovereignty and territoriality of this sacred cosmos have been greatly reduced in Western History—partly as a result of the activities of the Jewish, Christian, and particularly Protestant religions themselves. The effect has been an increasingly secularized society in which religion is not a "sacred canopy" over the whole. In these circumstances religious institutions have two choices. On the one hand they can opt for socially engineering themselves so that they can the better sell their wares on the basis of social needs. On the other hand they can draw inward and separate from the world in order to supply increasingly narrow cultic satisfactions.

Berger's analysis of human social involvement is that men externalize to form their world. They then internalize this world which has been objectified by corporate apprehension. If this model is applied to the church as a corporeality, it would appear that there is simply no way that a withdrawal would be any-

thing other than a dehumanizing process. On the other side, for the church to seek world formation by pandering to every anthropological urge would denature the original sanctifying function of religion.

One can, of course, hope that religion will rise again, having been martyred either for having separated and made itself "the way" or for having involved itself in human concerns and made itself of no reputation. Without the help of this kind of theologizing, this book can leave one with a feeling of hopelessness. To be sure, this is not Peter Berger's intention, since he is one of the most brilliant sociologists having "specially warm feelings (for) the theologically concerned reader."

DIMENSIONS OF SPIRITUALITY

Edited by Christian Duquoc
New York: Herder & Herder, 1970

This book is the social concern volume in the Concilium series and is *must* reading for Catholic chaplains as they consider the question of the church's prophetic role in today's troubled world. Its contributors tackle the question of witness to people whose hopes have been stunted by social problems like industrialization, violence and drugs. How can religion speak to the cynicism and despair of people in a time of great loss of interest in religion? Does spirituality as a privatized matter provide an answer? Does the church lose spirituality in too easily accepting theological politicizing? As poles of reference, Gabriel Marcel and Ernest Block are background sources of insight dealt with specifically by Lionel Blain, who is just one of the twelve contributors to this book. Of special interest to chaplains will be the article by Jan Peters on Black Theology, which phenomenon has taken the freedom theme of the Old Testament and, sifting from the New, has challenged the universal applicability of "White Theology." That Utopian factors in the Christian message can effectively lead us back to important social tasks is made clear by Michel Demaison in a chapter on this subject vital to the question of action versus meditation. These are just a few of the stimulating facets discussed in a tight little volume which could serve as the basis for a chaplain seminar.

While this book is a compilation which should not lead us to quick conclusions, this reader was left with the belief that the best option is a combination of an emphasis on privatized devotion as well as socialized theories. This kind of universal (catholic) holistic approach is the best witness to the hope we proclaim.

CHANGE OF ADDRESS

Name _____

Old Address _____

_____

New Address _____

_____

Send to: Military Chaplains' Review
US Army Chaplain Board
Fort George G. Meade, MD 20755